

242.51  
FAI

N° 26

Paper no. 26

Minutes

of the

Working

Committee

1958

Geneva

Switzerland

# COMMISSION ON FAITH AND ORDER

World

Council

of

Churches

LIBRARY

World Council of Churches  
17, route de Malagnou, GENEVA

## CONTENTS

	Page
MEETING OF THE WORKING COMMITTEE . . . . .	1
ATTENDANCE . . . . .	1
PROCEEDINGS . . . . .	2
1. Secretary's Report . . . . .	2
2. Study Commission on Institutionalism . . . . .	7
3. Theological Commission on Worship . . . . .	9
4. Theological Commission on Christ and the Church . . . . .	10
5. Theological Commission on Tradition and Traditions . . . . .	11
6. Lutheran-Reformed Consultation . . . . .	13
7. Requests from Theological Commissions . . . . .	14
8. Co-ordination and Publication of Theological Commissions' work . . . . .	15
9. Membership of Theological Commissions . . . . .	17
10. Enlarged Sessions	
(1) Ordination of Women . . . . .	18
(2) Faith and Order and Union Negotiations . . . . .	23
(3) Week of Prayer for Christian Unity . . . . .	25
11. Report of Oberlin Conference . . . . .	30
12. Relations with Moscow Patriarchate . . . . .	31
13. Preparations for Third Assembly . . . . .	32
14. New Projects	
(1) Faith and Order Digest . . . . .	34
(2) Faith and Order Reporter . . . . .	35
(3) Proposal for a Consultation on Church Unity . . . . .	36
15. Baptism Study . . . . .	38
16. Staff, Travel and Budget . . . . .	38
17. Report of the Committee on the Future of Faith and Order . . . . .	40
18. Schedule of Future Meetings . . . . .	41
19. National Faith and Order Committees . . . . .	42
20. Inter-Confessional Consultations . . . . .	42
21. Youth Conference . . . . .	43
22. Check List of Faith and Order Publications . . . . .	43
23. Faith and Order Archives . . . . .	43
APPENDIX I . . . . .	44
APPENDIX II . . . . .	47
APPENDIX III . . . . .	51
MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION . . . . .	58
MEMBERSHIP OF THE THEOLOGICAL COMMISSIONS . . . . .	59

# MEETING OF THE WORKING COMMITTEE

15-20 JULY 1958

GENEVA

---

## ATTENDANCE

### Officers

Dr. O. S. TOMKINS (*Chairman*)  
Dean DOUGLAS HORTON (*Chairman of the Commission*)  
\* Bishop J. E. L. NEWBIGIN (*Vice-Chairman of the Commission*)  
Dr. K. R. BRIDSTON (*Secretary*)

### Members

PERCY BARTLETT, Principal J. R. CHANDRAN, Professor H. D'ESPINE, Professor G. FLOROVSKY, Professor R. R. HARTFORD, Professor CHR. KONSTANTINIDIS, Dr. J. E. SKOGLUND, Professor T. M. TAYLOR, Professor G. F. WINGREN

### Substitutes

Dr. J. W. KENNEDY (for Bishop Angus Dun), Dean J. R. NELSON (for Professor Outler), Professor R. E. OSBORN (for President Gresham), Dr. VILMOS VAJTA (for Professor Kantonen)

### Visitors

at Open Sessions included : M<sup>lle</sup> M. BAROT, Mr. L. MUDGE, and representatives from the YMCA, YWCA and WSCF

### Staff

\* Dr. W. A. VISSER 'T HOOFT, Dr. R. S. BILHEIMER, Dr. H. H. HARMS, The Rev. FRANCIS H. HOUSE

### Minute Secretary

MISS ELIZABETH SWAYNE

---

\* = Attended part-time.

## Apologies

for absence were received from : Bishop DUN, President GRESHAM, Dr. JACOB, Metropolitan JUHANON MAR THOMA, Professor KANTONEN, Principal MARSH, Professor OUTLER, Dr. PAYNE, Principal ROBERTS, Professor SCHLINK, Professor SKYDSGAARD and Professor TORRANCE

## PROCEEDINGS

The CHAIRMAN (Dr. Oliver S. Tomkins) invited *Bishop Newbigin* to open the meeting with prayer, since he was only able to be present for the first session of the Working Committee's meeting.

The Minutes of the meeting of 20 July 1957 were approved.

### 1. SECRETARY'S REPORT

It has not yet been a year since I took over the work of Secretary from my predecessor, Dr. Robert Nelson. Most of my year has been spent in discovering what big shoes he has left me to try to fill. I am both surprised, and somewhat overwhelmed, with the programme that Faith and Order is carrying on and impressed with the orderly state in which it has been left to me. I only hope that I may be able to carry on the excellent tradition which I have inherited.

Needless to say, this has been an exciting year for me. Partly this has been the excitement of discovering the wide range which Faith and Order covers in its programme. I have sat in on theological commissions, both stimulated and educated by their discussions. At times I have wondered whether Faith and Order has not overestimated the limits of ecumenical comprehension when a Lutheran Bultmannite asserts that "we really cannot understand one another" and a Greek Orthodox replies "it really doesn't matter". This was one discussion I participated in this year. It sounds somewhat hopeless, does it not? In fact, the chairman after this particular exchange introduced the question: "Should this commission continue or should it give up and go home?" Fortunately — and perhaps this is a testimony to the cohesive powers of Faith and Order — the particular group decided to go on and are well on their way in plans for a composite volume representing their deliberations.

These experiences, which represent new discoveries of the meaning of ecumenical fellowship and study, have been exciting for me. They have meant seeing Faith and Order, not as a historical tradition or an impressive name, but a living movement made up of a great variety of persons from all sorts of backgrounds and affiliations, bound together by a common concern for the unity of the Church and a common desire both to be loyal to their own tradition and to manifest their essential oneness in Christ. That is what keeps together those who, humanly speaking, have every reason to believe that there are separations between them which are unbridgeable — gulfs made up of things past but also "things present" and "things to come": when they try to meet, both "height" and "depth" seem to stand between them. Certainly this is evident in the discussions I have sat in on this year, and I am sure it is true, in varying

degrees, of all the meetings which Faith and Order has been responsible for this year. Yet, somehow through the grace of God, these ecumenical meetings bridge the unbridgeable. The theological commissions do not "give up and go home." They continue. They grow. They produce papers and reports. If we were not so ecumenically calloused, we would see what a miracle it is that instead of disintegrating as they might well do (and have done in other eras of church history), these multi-lingual, multi-national, multi-confessional Faith and Order groups grow together. Perhaps it is naive to be surprised at this. However, I believe there are theological and historical reasons for being surprised too; those who suppose that Faith and Order has lost its vitality might well ponder the continuing miracles that its theological commissions represent — each time one of them meets it represents an ecumenical triumph over the gulfs and separations which so tragically divide Christ's Church and is a proleptic manifestation of that unity for which Faith and Order seeks and prays.

To have the opportunity as Secretary to see Faith and Order "personalized" in this way is one which I wish I could share with all of you. But I am not sure you would wish to share the technical and organizational problem which this poses. As one enters this work as a new-comer and little by little gets an impression of the dimensions of the work to be done, it is very easy to fall into complete despair. How does one begin to tie all the threads that make up the fabric of Faith and Order? The Secretary cannot of course do this entirely himself. But he is constantly faced with the demand that at least in his own mind he should try to see a "wholeness" in it all. Only then can he begin to co-ordinate in an organizational way the variety of Faith and Order activities. The most obvious way is, of course, travel. My predecessor, Dr. Nelson, was a great traveller — one of the reasons, in my opinion, for the success of his regime as Secretary. In the little I have moved about this year, the value of seeing Faith and Order at first hand, as it were, of meeting the individuals involved in our Faith and Order meetings, of consulting with the officers of the commissions, of taking part in the actual commission sessions themselves, can hardly be over-estimated. I have been in Germany on two occasions, in England on two, and I have returned just before this meeting from a trip to the United States, at which time I took part in a consultation preparatory to setting up Faith and Order work in relation to the National Council of Churches, of which more will be reported later in the meeting.

The travel I have done has raised the question for me: how much co-ordination of Faith and Order activities can the Secretary hope to do and how much should he do? In respect to the latter, it is heartening to see the energy and time which the members of the theological commissions — especially their officers — so generously give to this work. It may be both the strength and weakness of Faith and Order's present mode of operation that when one attends a meeting of the American Section of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church, the Chairman, Professor Calhoun, not only presides at the sessions but operates the tape-recorder and is serving coffee and ice-cream as a waiter during the meals! There is a genuine sense of "possession" on the part of the officers of these commissions and perhaps it is one of the virtues of a small Faith and Order full-time staff that this feeling is encouraged. The officers and members of the commissions know how little they can count on Geneva for assistance and as a result their work becomes even more their own than it otherwise would.



Nevertheless, the problem still remains as to how all this can be bound together into a "wholeness" of Faith and Order. In a quite practical way this has become urgent by the fact that the theological commissions are working on a ten-year time schedule and they are working in separate sections — American, European (and Asian in one case) — which must at some time or another meet together. Can all this furious activity be pulled together by 1963? It is only a question in my mind, but the guidance of the Working Committee on this point would be greatly appreciated.

It is the question of co-ordination and direction towards the termination of their work which is crucial in the work of the theological commissions at the moment. And these commissions are the core of Faith and Order's programme. This Working Committee must give a good amount of its time, therefore, to these concerns. Other parts of the continuing programme will also require attention, which can be very briefly indicated.

### I. Regional Conferences and Consultations

The most notable event in this recently inaugurated sphere of Faith and Order activity has been the Oberlin North American Faith and Order Conference. Under the able guidance of Professor Paul Minear, Oberlin proved to be a success even before it was actually held. That is, the preparatory work in local study groups, which was the feature of Oberlin and which Professor Minear describes in the introduction to the volume reporting the Conference, was so thorough and brought into the ecumenical conversation so many churches previously outside the ecumenical circle, that had not Oberlin itself ever taken place this preliminary work would have justified the resources put into it. The success of Oberlin naturally raises the question of to what extent similar regional conferences using similar preparatory techniques might be sponsored by Faith and Order in other parts of the world.

One of the results of Oberlin was a concern to create a department of Faith and Order Studies in the National Council of Churches in the U.S.A., and, as I have mentioned, while in the United States (and indeed one of my chief purposes in being there) was to take part in consultations leading to the setting up of this. This "rooting" of Faith and Order in national ground is undoubtedly to be welcomed. Nevertheless, there are problems as to how these kinds of national or regional Faith and Order expressions are to be related to the total programme of Faith and Order as it is centred in the World Council of Churches here in Geneva. During this year I have approached by letter National Christian Councils to get information on the existence of national committee of Faith and Order and have sought to find what they are doing or not doing. It is my impression from the replies I have already received that these national groups are in considerable doubt as to what their task should be. Can and should we do more from Geneva to activate and assist them?

The other type of special consultation is the Lutheran-Reformed Consultation which has had another meeting this spring. This will be reported by Dr. Harms, but in passing it should be said that the members of the Consultation seem to be increasingly convinced of its value, and this might suggest that Faith and Order should expand its programme in such inter-confessional consultations. An Orthodox-non-Orthodox meeting has been proposed and there are others which could also prove worthwhile.

## II. Week of Prayer for Christian Unity

It may be reported that the distribution of the Week of Prayer leaflet of Faith and Order has been on a larger scale than ever before. It has been translated into several languages besides the English-French-German versions which are distributed from Geneva. It has been printed and distributed independently in Great Britain, Ceylon, Argentina, the U.S.A., Canada and several other countries. The widespread use which the leaflet has been given, and the increasingly widespread observance of the Week of Prayer throughout the world is most encouraging. As usual, a problem is involved, which the documentation you have indicates. We are in very close and friendly contact with the Couturier group in their observance of the Week. A small group of us attended the opening of the Week of Prayer in Lyon this year and had most fascinating and helpful contacts there, including some preliminary discussions about closer ties between our observances. But elsewhere, especially in the United States, the relation between Roman Catholic and non-Roman Catholic observances has been less happy, and questions are being raised as to whether, with the tendencies revealed in your documents accentuated in some Roman Catholic circles, it is right for Faith and Order to continue its support of a Week of Prayer for Christian Unity at this precise time.

## III. Church Union Negotiations

The usual work of collecting and distributing documents on union negotiations continues. As I have indicated in my paper for the Future Committee, it is in this field that I believe Faith and Order might well give greater emphasis in the future. This would not only mean providing information of a technical character as now, but comparative studies, analyses, theological appraisals and critical commentaries on particular schemes. Needless to say, this would have to be done with great caution and the utmost care taken that the rights of the churches were fully respected. However, more could be done than at present, and I believe that in order for Faith and Order to be relevant to the present ecumenical situation it must give greater attention to the particular and existential problems of church unity which union schemes and negotiations represent.

There are two new projects which I would like this Committee to consider. The first has already been proposed last year by Bishop Angus Dun. That is for an "Ecumenical Digest," which would draw together in loose-leaf form some of the ecumenical pronouncements, particularly those of Faith and Order conferences, on various topics—for example, intercommunion, baptism, apostolic succession, etc. I have put together a possible pattern for one of the sections of such a Digest, which you will find in your documentation. One of the purposes of such a Digest would be to provide a useful reference book for ecumenical conferences. Presumably it would help to keep the ecumenical discussion moving by preventing the same material being discussed over and over again without recognition of this repetition and without realization that certain agreements have been achieved in past conferences. Whether such a Digest can be useful in this way without being unmanageable in size is not yet certain, but it is worth further investigation.

The second new project is the sending out of selected documents under the title of "Faith and Order Reporter" (or a similar title) to the members of the various commissions of Faith and Order. I have given this a trial run with the

documents on Apostolic Succession, which most of you have probably received. I have already had a number of letters from commission members expressing their support of this idea. But any further move must depend on the approval of the Working Committee. As I explained in the covering letter to this trial set of papers, one of the chief purposes would be to make use of the present membership of Faith and Order commissions as a restricted forum for the ecumenical discussion and consideration of themes of special interest to the Faith and Order constituency and particularly of those issues of such delicate character that they would suffer from exposure to a wider group. I am thinking here especially of issues arising out of or related to union negotiations.

One of the incidental virtues of such a project would be to activate the Commission on Faith and Order and begin to transform it more into a working group than it is at present. When one reads the membership list of the Commission and realizes the immense theological and ecumenical experience which is represented by it, it seems extraordinarily unfortunate that we have not found a way in which these potential resources can be used other than at the stated triennial meetings.

Finally, I would like to express my deep conviction of the importance of Faith and Order. I find it a great privilege to be allowed to share in the life of Faith and Order as a Secretary. I am grateful to you for your support and your patience as I have begun to fit into the work. It is not only this that makes me happy to be able to work in Faith and Order. During this year I have become convinced that there is a great need for the witness of Faith and Order for manifest church unity, not only to the churches but within the ecumenical fellowship itself. The ecumenical movement has become so large and multi-dimensional that unity often is made only one among many things which "ecumenical" is thought to stand for. Furthermore, among the younger generation of ministers and theologians there is an almost inevitable cynicism about the ecumenical movement. It has been so long popularized and romanticized in our churches (even though the task of ecumenical education is far from finished!) that some of the keenest of the new generation of ministers and theologians are asking: Is unity *really* as important as we have been led to think in the ecumenical movement? Finally, for many co-operation and consultation and conference have become the end of the ecumenical movement. G. B. Shaw once asked: "Is murder with a poisoned arrow different from murder with a Mauser rifle?" We could also ask: "Is divisiveness under the cloak of ecumenism different from divisiveness under the cloak of sectarianism?"

Unity is still a live issue in the ecumenical movement. And Faith and Order, by its tradition and by its charter, has a unique calling to renew the sense of urgency in regard to unity in our generation. Once again we must pray with Couturier for "visible unity", "in the way Christ wills and by the means he chooses."

At the conclusion of the report the CHAIRMAN commented that most of the points raised in it would come up for discussion later on in the agenda, but that questions could be put to the Secretary directly. Dean NELSON said that the question of the relationship of the Secretary to the Theological Commissions needed clarification. When he had been secretary it had been found natural for him to be concerned with making arrangements for the meetings of the European Sections, and he had in addition always attended such meetings



whenever he could. But with the American Sections this had not been possible, and they had had in the nature of things to be left more on their own. This could, however, lead to a certain amount of confusion and lack of liaison.

## 2. STUDY COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONALISM

The SECRETARY recalled that both he and his predecessor Dean Nelson had been present at the first meeting of the Commission at Boston in July 1957, at which the programme of work was outlined. That document was made available to the Faith and Order Commission at its meeting in New Haven the same year (FOC Paper 25, pp. 24-28). He recalled that on that occasion Professor Schlink had questioned the extent to which this approach to the question of institutionalism was justified, and had asked whether the theological approach to the question of institutionalism was taken seriously enough by this study. Since then another meeting of the Study Commission had been held in 1958 at which the terms of the study had been further sharpened and defined, and several projects outlined for its work. One of the difficulties which the Working Committee would have to face was that this Commission was really international, and had no European and Asian Sections. Its members were drawn from both Europe and America, and now had an Asian member also. This raised the question not only of finance, but also that of holding the Commission together as a working group. In the past this study had been financed by a special grant through the generosity of the Disciples of Christ, but this money was now almost exhausted. The Study Commission was very anxious to hold a meeting with all its members present, and the Working Committee would have to consider the possibility of finding additional resources for this.

The Study Commission on Institutionalism was also anxious to have some meetings jointly with the other Theological Commissions. The institutionalism study was an entirely new approach and its members felt that it would be helpful if some of the preliminary results of their work could be exposed to other Commissions for discussion. It would be difficult to arrange this, but the Secretary felt that means should be found somehow, as the idea was an interesting one which should be followed up.

Bishop NEWBIGIN asked whether the theological assumptions underlying these forms of thought had been scrutinized. In his reply the SECRETARY said that one of the difficulties was to find a terminology which was acceptable to all. It frequently happened that the same word was interpreted differently by members. Professor Ehrenström had said they were having first of all to study their "criteriology," and this was perhaps in part an answer to the question. Another problem was that it was not really possible to apply sociological terms purely and simply to church organization, because the Church is the Church, and not merely an organization. Nonetheless it was very valuable to have this discussion concerning the relationship between sociology and theology. Professor FLOROVSKY said that while he did not believe sociological analyses could be uncritically applied to church life, he nevertheless felt that this new approach was valuable, as it led to a wider recognition of the existence of the problems involved.

The SECRETARY then put before the Working Committee copies of the Program of Work \* which the Study Commission had adopted at its 1958 meet-

\* See Appendix I.

ing, together with a tentative outline of a projected symposium which the members wished the Working Committee to comment upon. He also asked for formal permission for the Study Commission to hold a meeting in Europe in 1959.

With regard to the request concerning publication of results, the CHAIRMAN queried whether a symposium would be the best solution. His own reaction would be to give a caution about the size of the proposed volume. Professor HARTFORD commented with approval on the extent to which the members had already got their material in draft form. Dr. BILHEIMER feared for the usefulness of the outline in its present form, considering that as it stood it showed a tendency on the part of the Study Commission to diverge somewhat from its original purpose. He thought it necessary that the concern for unity should be more clearly shewn. Dr. KENNEDY thought that if a way of conveying the Study Commission's material to the other Commissions could be found, it would be of more value than publication. Principal CHANDRAN thought the case studies should be published in book form, and the other articles in periodicals. Professor FLOROVSKY wanted the work of the Study Commission to be more clearly understood. The whole concept had been raised in connection with the question of non-theological factors. He understood some difficulty had been experienced in getting material and information for the case studies. He felt the historical approach was inevitable, as otherwise there would be mere theorizing, which would not be related to reality. He queried, however, the usefulness of the proposed study on "Institutionalism in the Early Church." Professor WINGREN referred to Dean Muelder's report of the previous year (FOC Paper 25, p. 24) in which he had said that the number of projects which the Commission could carry out under its own auspices was limited; and suggested that, having approved the aim of the Study Commission, the Working Committee should remind them of Dean Muelder's report, and suggest that only a small symposium should be published. Most of the Study Commission's other work should be published in periodicals. Dr. SKOGLUND suggested that the Working Committee should defer comment for another year until it had been possible to see more of the material which the Study Commission was producing.

Professor OSBORN thought the Commission deserved some encouragement with regard to their proposed outline. It was distressing that so little had been done in this field up to the present time. The draft of the Study Commission's paper on the Baptist-Disciples conversations had been regarded as one of the most important contributions to the discussions between the two churches, and had very greatly impressed Disciples historians. Dr. BILHEIMER felt that the Commission had become involved in a difficult situation. Although they had a clear idea of what they should do, they had found that there was very little material, and so they had had to create it to a large extent. Consequently they had begun to feel that this gathering of material was their main task. The Working Committee should call them back to their original purpose, but at the same time encourage them. The work they were doing was undoubtedly valuable; but their symposium should be more on the lines of their original purpose.

Professor Taylor asked if there were any Europeans in this Commission. The CHAIRMAN mentioned Dr. Dombois, Dr. Gustafsson and a new member

Dr. Pickering. Professor TAYLOR thought the existing Commission should confine itself to North America at present, and other regional commissions could be set up for Europe and Asia if this was thought to be valuable. Dr. NELSON was unable to agree with Professor Taylor that the North American and European situations were so different. Dr. BILHEIMER asked that contact should be established with studies now under way in the younger churches.

In summarizing the discussion, the CHAIRMAN then proposed replying to the Study Commission on the following lines :

(1) With regard to the proposed symposium, the Working Committee welcomed the work done by the Study Commission to produce concrete results. Nonetheless, it was necessary to have regard to the finances of the problem, and they wished to suggest

(a) That the volume should be connected particularly with the problem of unity and not be merely a general discussion of institutionalism as a whole :

(b) Case studies should have preference over the more technical material which would be better published in periodicals :

(c) A volume of not more than 40,000 words should be considered, and then *only if a publisher could be secured*. The Working Committee could not accept responsibility for a volume larger than 40,000 words.

(2) With regard to the requests for (a) a joint meeting in Europe in 1959, with the request for the Secretary to give help in arranging this, and (b) the holding of a meeting in conjunction with the Faith and Order Commission meeting in 1960, these should be agreed.

(3) The Committee should record its gratification and appreciation of the work being done by the Study Commission, particularly in the breaking of new ground on this subject, even where the concern was not a primarily a Faith and Order one.

This was agreed.

### 3. THEOLOGICAL COMMISSION ON WORSHIP

#### (i) North American Section

#### (ii) European Section

Since no member from either of these Sections was present, the SECRETARY gave a brief general report. He recalled the difficulties encountered in the formation of this Commission, but said that in the American Section, the Chairman, Professor Sittler, had stated that the meeting held during this year had been very useful, and he expected that they would now be able to make real progress. Professor Preston Roberts was now the Secretary of this Section. Similarly, the European Section was also getting under way and now had almost a full complement of members.

#### (iii) Asian Section

Principal CHANDRAN regretted that he was unable to give a report, since he had been in America during the past year. The SECRETARY reported that



Bishop Lakdasa de Mel had agreed to become Vice-Chairman of this Section. Principal CHANDRAN stated that the main difficulty facing the Asian Section was that of arranging meetings of the members, owing to the great distances involved. He wondered whether it would be possible for a meeting of the officers of all three sections of the Worship Commission to be arranged. Both President Kishi and Bishop Lakdasa de Mel might be able to attend such a meeting, which would be very valuable. He also added that in India the Liturgical Commission of the Church of South India had been very active, and had brought out new Orders of Service for Baptism, Morning Service and Ordination. This was of great interest for the work of the Worship Commission. The CHAIRMAN expressed the hope that much of the literature on liturgy and worship which was now being produced was being collected in the General Library of the World Council for the assistance of people doing research. Dr. HARMS referred to the difficulty found by the staff in obtaining information about all such new works, and asked that members of the Commission should co-operate by informing the Library whenever they discovered some work which they thought should be obtained.

#### 4. THEOLOGICAL COMMISSION ON CHRIST AND THE CHURCH

##### (i) American Section

Dean NELSON reported on behalf of this Section, which had recently held a meeting at which Professor Richard Niebuhr's paper "The Church Defines Itself in the World" had been read. This paper, a discussion of the way in which the Holy Spirit works in the world outside the Church, was of particular significance, because of the way in which it questioned the christological basis upon which the work of this Commission was founded. So fundamental a criticism naturally aroused particular interest. Professor Niebuhr's contention was that in current theology there is so much emphasis laid on the work of Christ and the presence of Christ that the other two Persons of the Trinity fade into the background. Dean Nelson recalled how in both Sections of the Commission members had reminded themselves that it was not possible to be solely christological, and that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was very much undeveloped. Though Professor Niebuhr had probably exaggerated this tendency, his criticism was, in Dean Nelson's opinion, justified. Other members of the Commission had tried to point out that the concern of the Commission was not to obscure the Trinity, but that a christological approach in fact brought out the Trinity more clearly. A further criticism made by Professor Niebuhr was of the introverted nature of the study: when one talks of the unity of the Church, one should not forget the unity of all things in Christ. As a summary Dean Nelson read the closing paragraphs of Professor Niebuhr's paper.

Another important paper had been given by Professor Florovsky on "Christology and Tradition," which traced a period of early church history and the eastern Fathers. Dean Nelson emphasized the value of this detailed analysis of the Chalcedonian period, and said how much of the material being published for the 1500th anniversary of Chalcedon was of use to the Commission on Christ and the Church.

The American Section had also discussed a book by one of its members, Professor Welch, on *The Reality of the Church*, and this was also to be discussed



by the European Section of the Commission at Lund the following week. Next year it was hoped to have a joint meeting with the European Section in Europe — if possible to be extended to two weeks. If this could be arranged, it was hoped to be able to produce an Interim Report for the Faith and Order Commission in 1960. If possible the joint meeting next year should be held at the end of July, when at least five members of the American Section would in any case be in Europe for other meetings.

If the joint meeting were not held, the American Section envisaged holding their own meeting in June 1959, when five papers would be discussed.

## (ii) European Section

Professor WINGREN, in reporting on behalf of this Section, commented that there was little to report, since the last meeting of the Section had taken place a week before the Working Committee met in 1957, while this year's meeting would not take place until the following week. At this forthcoming meeting, however, it was proposed to discuss Professor Cullmann's *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, Professor Welch's *The Reality of the Church*, and two papers by Professor Torrance, "Israel and the Church" and "What is the Church?." There would also be a discussion of the Report on the relations between Anglicans and Presbyterians in England and Scotland. Dean NELSON pointed out that this was because this was the only church union scheme to be worked out directly in connection with the work of the Christ and the Church Commission. Professor WINGREN stated that Professor Welch's book could also be regarded as a direct outcome of the work of the Commission, and was of particular interest for that reason. The SECRETARY regretted that Professor Welch was unable to be present with the European Section at Lund.

Principal CHANDRAN recalled that when the Commission was first formed it was understood that its work would throw light on many other problems. Was there any indication that this was happening? Dean NELSON said that this was certainly the case, although the process was a gradual one.

At the request of Professor WINGREN, copies of Professor Niebuhr's paper were made available for members of the Working Committee. The CHAIRMAN stressed the importance of reminding officers of all the Commissions that sufficient copies of all papers laid before theological commissions must be made available at the Geneva office for information and for circulation to those interested.

## 5. THEOLOGICAL COMMISSION ON TRADITION AND TRADITIONS

### (i) American Section

A report was given by Professor FLOROVSKY, who stressed how widespread in America was the interest in the study of tradition with which this Commission was concerned. Professor Outler had been invited to read a paper on "Church History and the Church" to the American Church History Society. This had also led to a discussion with Professor Pauck and Professor Pelikan on the meaning of tradition. It was important that the Commission should keep in touch with this body. The American Association of Theological Schools had received a grant to support further study of the inter-relations of church history and the ecumen-

ical concerns of the churches, and further studies were now being undertaken in this field in conjunction with the officers of the Commission. There was also to be a second Consultation of Church Historians at Bossey next year. The interest in America was very obvious: and groups were found to be forming spontaneously because of their interest.

With regard to the work of the Commission itself, the fourth meeting had been held this year in March. They felt their main aim was not to discuss first the concept of tradition, but try and find by historical research how tradition was functioning in the life of the churches. They then hoped to attempt to answer the question of what tradition meant, and how it was used. Some studies of the mediaeval period had been made by a Roman Catholic who was not a member of the Commission, and these would be published in book form under the title *Tradition in the Late Mediaeval Period to the Council of Trent*. Professor Hay had read a paper on "Scripture, Tradition and Allied Questions among British Protestants," and Professor Clebsch a memorandum on tradition in American churches, while Professor Florovsky himself, and Professor Outler, Professor Pauck, Professor Pelikan and Professor Fairweather were all engaged in writing papers for discussion at the next meeting of the Commission.

The main intention of the Commission was to summarize all these historical studies and probably to produce a book of a historical character. It would not be dry scholarship, because it would be seen how tradition was involved and was actually functioning throughout the whole life of the Church. The basis of this factual survey would then lead them to theological conclusions.

Professor Florovsky felt that this year the Commission had really come to feel itself to be one body. They had been joined for the first time by Professor Caird, and his contribution had been most helpful. Finally, he asked that the minutes of this meeting of the Commission might be circulated to members of the Working Committee, since they were anxious that their papers should be circulated and discussed.

## (ii) European Section

The SECRETARY reported on the meeting of this Section held at Arnoldshain in March 1958 at which he had been present. He explained that this Commission had experienced great difficulty in finding its way at this meeting, and indeed its Chairman, Professor Skydsgaard, had despaired of their being able to move forward at all, so diverse were the opinions and traditions represented. Nevertheless, the Commission had gone on to do some very useful work, and the members testified to the value of the meeting, so that it was considered worth while to continue.

The following papers were discussed:

Professor BONIS: "Kirche und Heiliger Geist in Orthodoxer Sicht."

Professor JENKINS: "Tradition and the Holy Spirit."

Professor LEUBA: "Das Werk des heiligen Geistes in der Zeit der Kirche nach dem Neuen Testament."

Professor SKYDSGAARD: Memorandum on the future work of the Commission.

At the next meeting a long paper was to be presented by Professor Leuba as a basic exposition of the subject, and after discussion other members would prepare papers from their own particular viewpoints in relation to this basic paper.

## 6. LUTHERAN-REFORMED CONSULTATION

At the outset of his report Dr. HARMS stressed that although at this stage the Consultation was not an actual union discussion, it nevertheless bore in mind the fact that at some future date it might become one. It was a very valuable discussion, and it was particularly important that among its members were Lutherans who had no Reformed vis-à-vis in their own countries, and also some Reformed members of churches in a similar position.

At the last meeting the theme discussed had been "The presence of Christ in the Church": not in the sense of his presence in the Sacraments but in a more general way. Papers had been contributed by Professor Mehl on the philosophical conception of "presence," Professor Bonnard on "The Presence of the Risen Lord and the Holy Spirit in the Church," and by Bishop Nygren and Dr. Metzger on "Christ's Presence in the Preached Word." The members had been asked to start from the living faith of the present day and not from the doctrinal statements of the 16th century, and this had led to a very live and stimulating discussion. Professor Brunner of Heidelberg, a particularly busy member of the Consultation, had been obliged to decide whether or not to retain membership of this or of another Commission, since he could no longer work on both; and after this particular discussion he had unhesitatingly chosen to retain membership of this Consultation — a very remarkable tribute to the value of its work. Next year the subject for discussion would be the question of Baptism.

It was pointed out that there were some members of the Consultation who had never attended its meetings. This was particularly a problem in such a comparatively small group: and the Working Committee suggested that the Co-chairmen should write to these members to find out if they wished to continue with the work of the Consultation.

In the discussion which followed Professor D'ESPINE expressed appreciation of the report and asked how long it was likely to be before the members of the Consultation felt they were in a position to report back on their work to their respective churches. Dr. HARMS in reply said that the decision was that each member should keep his particular church informed, but that nothing should appear in the open, and no formal statement should appear until either it was decided to discontinue, or the churches should wish to enter into official negotiations. Professor TAYLOR asked whether members were officially appointed, to which Dr. HARMS replied that after they had been selected the official permission of their churches had been sought and obtained. He also pointed out that since the conversations were informal the churches were in no way committed by them. In response to a further question from Professor TAYLOR concerning the geographic distribution of members, Dr. HARMS reported that there were Lutheran members from Sweden, Denmark, Norway, France and Germany; and Reformed members from Scotland, France, Sweden, Germany and the Netherlands. Dean NELSON asked whether there was any chance of the papers



discussed by this Consultation being distributed to other interested persons in Faith and Order, but Dr. HARMS said he thought it inadvisable at the present stage.

Professor WINGREN, in commenting on the papers on the real presence of Christ in the preached word, observed that if the Reformed members agreed to this they were surely giving up their traditional position. The Secretary however said that as a result of Professor Mehl's paper on the philosophic conception of "presence," both sides found that their original interpretation was so altered that the ground between them had changed completely.

Professor D'ESPINE asked whether the World Presbyterian Alliance and the Lutheran World Federation should not also be represented at meetings of the Lutheran-Reformed Consultation, or at least informed of the results of the discussions, since the churches represented were members of these international confessional bodies. Dr. HARMS replied that in fact representatives of these organizations were invited to the discussions, but he did not think the time had come for the discussions to be broadened.

Dr. HARMS then drew the attention of the Working Committee to *Koinonia*, a volume of studies on intercommunion which had been published during the previous year. He pointed out that this work was a continuation of work done for the Lund Conference.

## 7. REQUESTS FROM THEOLOGICAL COMMISSIONS

The SECRETARY reported that one of the chief problems being raised by the Theological Commissions was the question of when and how they were to work together, having regard to the final conclusion of their studies. They were still at present following their own lines of approach, but it was important that they should have the opportunity of meeting together sometime. The present tentative plan was to propose — with the Working Committee's approval — two joint meetings in 1959; one for the Study Commission on Institutionalism, to be held in Europe, and the second for the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church. The next meeting of the Faith and Order Commission would be in 1960 when it would be possible to arrange joint meetings for the Worship and Tradition Commissions. It could therefore be seen that the Commissions were thinking of the importance of completing their work by the terminal date set for them; but it was important for them at this point to be able to meet together. The SECRETARY then asked the Working Committee to consider this point, and the following requests were agreed:

- (a) *Theological Commission on Christ and the Church* — Request for joint meeting of American and European Sections in July/August 1959
- (b) *Study Commission on Institutionalism* — Request for meeting in Europe in early August 1959
- (c) *Theological Commission on Worship (East Asian Section)* —

Principal CHANDRAN spoke of the difficulties encountered in keeping in contact with the National Continuation Committees on Worship in the different Asian countries, and wondered whether it might not be possible to obtain



co-operation from the East Asia Christian Conference through its Secretary, Dr. D. T. Niles. Accordingly, he asked whether the Working Committee would pass a formal resolution authorizing him to approach the East Asia Christian Conference on this question. The following resolution was **passed** unanimously :

“In view of the importance for the East Asia Theological Commission on Worship of National Consultations or Conferences and in view of the practical difficulties in organizing such meetings, *resolved* that Principal Chandran be asked to discuss with the secretariat of the East Asia Christian Conference means whereby the East Asia Christian Conference might help the work of the National Continuation Committees on Worship, particularly those in Indonesia, Philippines and Japan.”

## 8. CO-ORDINATION AND PUBLICATION OF THEOLOGICAL COMMISSIONS' WORK

The question of the co-ordination of the work of the Theological Commissions and the publication of their results was then discussed. Dr. VAJTA thought it essential that provision should be made for joint study, as otherwise no co-ordination would be possible, and the SECRETARY added that this was the general feeling in all the Commissions. The CHAIRMAN asked whether all the Commissions saw joint meetings as a preliminary to producing material for the Combined Meeting of the Commissions in 1963, and the SECRETARY agreed that this was so. Dr. BILHEMER pointed out that the form in which their results were produced was also important, and the CHAIRMAN thought that the officers of the Commissions should be consulted about the form their material appeared to demand.

Bishop NEWBIGIN wondered whether it might not be possible for the Commissions to produce some of their work before 1963. It was a long time ahead, and this pace involved a conception of the speed of human life which he personally could not accept. He reminded the Working Committee of the ultimate aim — to bring the churches together in the truth. The studies had been authorized at Lund in 1952, and if they did not come out for 11 years — one-third of a generation — the world would very likely have forgotten about them by that time. He suggested that, while retaining the Commissions in being, something should be produced by 1960, so that reactions could be obtained from a wider public. Even allowing for the fact that fundamental research such as was involved in these discussions could not be hurried, he thought the Working Committee should try to impress upon the Commissions the urgency of the problem.

While agreeing that many would sympathize with this view, the CHAIRMAN reminded the Working Committee that it was not always possible to regulate the pace at which each individual Commission worked. Some Commissions had not been able to have more than two meetings. Professor FLOROVSKY added that the Commissions had been told not to rush their work : the ten-year period had been suggested at the Lund Conference. The Sections of the Worship Commission had been particularly unfortunate. With regard to the Commission on Tradition, however, something had already been published by the Chairman

of the American Section which gave the general public some idea of the work they had been doing.

The CHAIRMAN estimated that about twenty articles and several books had been published which came directly out of the work of the Commissions. He added that one of the things for which Faith and Order stood was scholarly production at a scholarly pace, and it was an ingredient in the life of Faith and Order which had to be respected. Nevertheless, it was right that from time to time the urgency of the task should be recalled.

The CHAIRMAN then went on to point out that so far only the question of the symposium proposed by the Study Commission on Institutionalism had been dealt with; but, if all the Theological Commissions continued with their plans, when the Combined Meeting of the Faith and Order Commission and the Theological Commissions was held in 1963 there would be no less than seven theological volumes of one sort or another let loose that year, and it was therefore very necessary that further thought should be given to this problem.

Dr. BILHEIMER said he thought that Bishop Newbigin's comment had been concerned more with the impression of this work on the public rather than with the actual time involved. As a result, he wondered whether it might not be possible to publish an interim volume which would attempt to assess the work of all the various Commissions in a reasonably small symposium. Such a book could either be written by a small group of three or four; or perhaps by one individual who might in a sabbatical year be able to prepare a draft which would then be subjected to criticism by the group. If something like this could be done it would mean that the work of the Theological Commissions would have just that much more impact. The CHAIRMAN, while approving of the idea in general felt that there would be difficulties in carrying it out, particularly in getting someone with the necessary time available to give to the work. He wondered whether it would be possible to get the chairmen of the various Commissions together to see whether some of their material intended for publication could be assembled. It would then only require someone to provide a commentary which would give continuity to the various papers. Each Commission would provide one or two essays which they were prepared to release in advance. What he had in mind was something on the lines of the book called *Mysterium Christi* — a book of essays which had very little in common except that they were about the "mysterium Christi."

The CHAIRMAN was unwilling to adopt any plan which threw a burden of extra work on the chairmen of the Commissions, and wondered if it would be sufficient to embody the idea in a letter to the chairmen asking them to set aside two days at the 1960 meeting to discuss the feasibility of a project of this kind. Dr. VAJTA considered that in view of the late start made by the European Section of the Worship Commission it would not be possible for them to produce a published volume before 1963 at the earliest. Principal CHANDRAN agreed that much the same applied to the Asian Section: possibly by 1963 they might be able to produce a volume giving surveys of worship practices in the different countries represented, but he did not think it would be possible for them to come to any conclusions by that time.

The CHAIRMAN thought that in view of what was emerging in the discussion it would seem desirable to have the meeting of the chairmen in 1960 to discuss

not only the interim volume but also what form their final results would take. Professor HARTFORD suggested that the chairmen could be asked by correspondence whether they were in favour of producing such an interim volume, and if the answer were favourable, they could have their material ready by 1960 when they met, so that it would not take too long to get the volume ready for publication. The CHAIRMAN thought that the Secretary and Dr. Bilheimer should compose a letter to the chairmen explaining the idea, but considered that it would be better to approach them personally if possible. Dr. BILHEIMER agreed, and said the Secretary could discuss the question with the chairmen during the coming year, so that in a year's time the Working Committee would have a clear view of their opinions. If the idea was to be commended, it should be done at once, as a special fund would be required, and this would take time.

Dean HORTON asked if there were any chance of one of the Commissions being ready to publish results in two years' time. The SECRETARY thought the Commission on Christ and the Church might possibly do so, but Dean NELSON was convinced they would prefer more time than that. The SECRETARY asked to what extent this Commission was committed to the publication of a volume, to which Dean NELSON replied that no final decision had as yet been taken. The SECRETARY felt that he personally would prefer to see different individual views expressed rather than a synthesis: but each group had to be dealt with in terms of its own subject. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the pre-Lund volumes which had normally followed a pattern of 40-50 pages of summary and 200 or so pages of essays. He thought that if this plan were continued, the chairman should draw attention in the introductory report to the other published work of the members of the Commission concerned. Dean HORTON thought that an investigation into the sales of the pre-Lund volumes (particularly that on worship, which was frequently referred to) might give some indication of the circulation they could hope for for these volumes, but Professor OSBORN pointed out that much would depend on what the Commissions had in mind for their work, and the type of volume they wanted to publish. Professor KONSTANTINIDIS thought it would be more helpful if the secretaries of the Theological Commissions as well as their chairmen could attend the meeting proposed, but the CHAIRMAN pointed out that the difficulty was that whereas the chairmen were in fact all members of the Faith and Order Commission, in most cases the secretaries were not, so that it would be difficult to arrange a full attendance. He considered the discussion could be more fruitfully carried on next year, when the Secretary would have had time to find out more precisely what the Commissions were planning.

## 9. MEMBERSHIP OF THEOLOGICAL COMMISSIONS

### (1) Theological Commission on Christ and the Church

The resignation of Dr. G. W. Bromiley from both secretaryship and membership of the European Section of this Commission was reported, as a result of his appointment to a post in the United States. The Working Committee recommended that *Dr. G. R. Beasley-Murray* be appointed Secretary of this Section.

Dr. NELSON proposed that the Working Committee should recommend the American Section to consider appointing Dr. Bromiley as a member of that Section. There was general agreement for this proposal.



## (2) Theological Commission on Tradition and Traditions

It was reported that the Rev. D. T. Jenkins had resigned as secretary of the European Section of this Commission, although retaining his membership.

## (3) Theological Commission on Worship

Dean NELSON reminded the Committee that a new Orthodox member would be required for the European Section in view of the death of Professor Lossky.

# 10. ENLARGED SESSIONS

## (1) The Ordination of Women

M<sup>lle</sup> BAROT gave the first introductory talk, in which she explained the two documents before the Working Committee. They had been prepared by the Department on Co-operation of Men and Women in Church and Society at the request of the Church of Sweden, which wished to have a report giving information as to the practice regarding the ordination of women found amongst the churches in the World Council, and an account of the theological considerations governing such practice. The first document was a factual survey dealing with the present position in the churches as far as could be ascertained. The second was also largely a factual survey, since the Department was not theologically equipped to make the study as requested.

It was clear to the Department that the question of the ordination of women was only a small item among very many fields where the attempt was being made to discover room for co-operation. Nevertheless, it was a question which ought to be taken seriously by the churches because there were some women who felt a definite call to the full ministry of their own church. Moreover, a great number of the laity considered that the Church should genuinely recognize and make use of all the gifts given by the Holy Spirit, including those given to the laity; thus the question of the place of women in the Church was very closely connected with the thinking about the place of the laity in the Church. People had very great difficulty in understanding the difficulties seen by theologians with regard to the problem of women. It raised again and again the question "What is the Church?"

With regard to the positions taken by the churches, it could be seen that the line of those against the ordination of women cut across all confessional barriers. Much of the question appeared to be a matter of interpretation, and in all the churches where there had been discussion of this question at a serious level it had led to hermeneutical discussions. The Department had endeavoured to get as much information as possible about such studies, and some examples were given.

In conclusion, M<sup>lle</sup> Barot said that it was important to stress the fact that in the main the question of ordination represented only a relatively minor aspect of a much wider problem.

The CHAIRMAN thanked M<sup>lle</sup> Barot for her introduction, and for the valuable documentation prepared by her Department.



Professor WINGREN then discussed the situation which was now being faced in the Church of Sweden. The question of the ordination of women was one which had been raised from time to time in the 20th century, but during the past year it had become one of the main issues in the Church of Sweden.

1. The main problem which existed for Lutherans was that their teaching about women in the ministry was based on their attitude to the place of women in creation. But if the argument from the "order of creation" was held to exclude women from the ordained ministry, then it must equally exclude them from all other positions of authority in society.

The problem emerged vividly when the argument from the "order of creation" was used solely to keep women out of the ministry. If this argument were to be used, it must apply to all relationships in society, and not only in order to exclude women from the ministry.

2. There was also a problem for Lutherans arising out of consideration of the New Testament passages concerning the position of women in the Church (such as those where women are commanded to keep silent in church, as in I Cor. 14, I Tim. 2 and other such passages). It is, for example, possible to regard all orders laid down in the Bible as determinative for the regulation of church life; but that was not the way Luther read the Bible. He considered that whatever Christ said and everything he preached in his message of salvation should be included, as well as that which was peripheral to, but connected with, that salvation. Baptism, Absolution and Holy Communion were the necessary means to salvation, together with the preaching of the Gospel. Anything else which served this work of salvation might also be used freely, but it was not in the same category as those things which were necessary in the Church.

It was on this basis that the extreme freedom of the Lutherans with regard to order was to be seen, and it was on this that Luther based his arguments concerning the place of women. He had excluded women and children from the ministry and from preaching, not because it was forbidden in the New Testament, but because in his time it seemed unreasonable that they should preach and exercise the ministry. It was true he placed "women" and "children" on the same level, but this was only because it was a matter of convenience. Laurentius Petri, the Swedish reformer, too had said that Lutherans were not bound by the passage in I Cor. 14 where it stated that women were to keep silent in church. They observed it, but they were free to change it if it seemed reasonable to do so.

Thus if Lutherans based their arguments on the "order of creation" and upon the New Testament passages, they were leaving behind them Luther's way of reading the scriptures, and were thus abandoning an integral part of their fundamental basis: an argument used by the Free Churches in Sweden in the 19th century.

It was remarkable that the Free Churches, which claimed to base their church order strictly on New Testament principles, ordained women, whereas the Lutheran Church, which claimed to have more freedom at this point and was not strictly tied to New Testament order, did not.

3. There was also a third main form of argument against the ordination of women, founded upon the tradition of the Church. In many ways this was a very strong argument indeed, about which one could not argue. But the Lutheran Church could not draw any conclusions or make any statements of principle

on the basis of tradition : it could only look at the question from the point of view of whether it was reasonable and practicable. If one agreed that it was necessary to ordain women, then that implied a judgment on the practice of the churches all through the centuries. The struggle could be seen as one of expediency against principle. If the Lord willed that women should be in the ministry then it was just a question of obeying, and if necessary suffering, in the Church.

Where there was necessity, however, there was freedom. There was always the necessity of bringing the Gospel to the nations of the world, and the freedom to ordain women should be used if it would help to further this proclamation. But if it were shown that in a particular situation the Gospel was in some way obscured by the fact that women were ordained then it would not be justified as a reasonable practice. But it was necessary that practice should not become too rigid and a matter of necessity, so that the possibility of change, if expedient, should not be obscured. In such a situation the Church was not only free to take a decision, but had a real duty to do so.

4. Professor Wingren suggested that the result of admitting women to the ministry would not in fact be very great. The main problem facing the Swedish Church was the general decline in parish life, and one got the impression that this major problem was being obscured by the relatively minor one concerning the admission of women to the ministry : and the admission of women would not solve this main problem.

5. Professor Wingren felt, however, that it was a very real tragedy that in Sweden there had been no possibility of a real encounter on this question. Because those who had favoured the ordination of women and those who had opposed it had each regarded the other as not worth arguing with, the issue had hardly been dealt with at all. This was a real disaster, and meant that everywhere people felt that a decision of great importance was being taken which would in fact be no proper solution because no real encounter and discussion had ever taken place ; and great bitterness on both sides could remain.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Professor Wingren for his presentation. The SECRETARY then explained that when this issue had been originally put before the Department of Co-operation, they had felt that it was too large a question to be their concern alone : it was essentially a Faith and Order question also. Even though Faith and Order had no resources at present to carry on such an investigation, it was felt that at least the Working Committee ought to know what was being done on this problem which was concerned with inter-church relationships.

A question was then raised about Professor Wingren's use of the word "reasonable" in connection with the grounds on which the Lutheran Church would ordain women. Professor WINGREN said the word should have been "expedient" which was the better translation, while Professor FLOROVSKY commented that the Latin word was "conveniencia." In order to make the point clear Professor WINGREN went on to explain that the Lutheran attitude was that in order to preach the Gospel it was good, for example, to have bishops and priests or pastors, and to have a liturgical year. All these had been abolished by the Reformed tradition, but the Lutheran had kept them — not because they were necessary, but because it was convenient, and a different situation could quite well mean

that they would be changed. In the same way, women have in the past been excluded from the ministry, but here too, there was nothing to preclude change.

The CHAIRMAN asked Professor Wingren how much weight a Lutheran would give to (a) tradition, and (b) ecumenical consensus, in discussion of this question. Professor WINGREN said that a reply was difficult, because their confession stated that various forms of service and order within the church did not destroy the unity of the church, because the unity was to be found in preaching the Gospel, celebrating the Holy Communion and so on — the necessary acts. If these were there, then there was unity, and from the Lutheran point of view it did not matter if there were other divergencies of practice — these did not separate Lutherans from one another. The CHAIRMAN agreed, but pointed out that even if they did not separate Lutherans from one another, did they not separate Lutheran from non-Lutheran churches? Professor WINGREN said this was only a difficulty brought from outside. Certain things would mean little for Lutherans in principle, but as they lived in community and fellowship with other Christians for whom such things meant much, they could in a secondary way come to mean something even for Lutherans: but the argument must always be on the basis of love for the neighbour for whom such things were necessary.

Professor FLOROVSKY found it difficult to understand the sharp distinction made between the “order of creation” and the “order of redemption.” The relation between these two orders was a grave theological problem, but it was clear from the bible that the “order of creation” was there and could not be removed by the “order of redemption.” He was unable to regard the creation of men and women as something sociologically irrelevant. The order of creation made it clear that there must be some authority in society, and this question of authority was an important one. In the further discussion which followed, Professor OSBORN said that the Disciples of Christ who in their early days had interpreted the New Testament pattern with regard to women somewhat strictly, had been led more recently to take with much greater seriousness the text in Gal. 3<sup>28</sup>, so that now all the offices in their church were open to women, although in practice their pastors were men.

M<sup>lle</sup> BAROT explained that she had urged that the question of the ordination of women should be discussed by Faith and Order because her Department had so many other projects to deal with that it was impossible for them to give it adequate attention. The CHAIRMAN said that while all would agree that it was an important theological question and would require to be worked at over a period of time by adequately equipped theologians, this raised two questions for Faith and Order — (1) Was it a legitimate study for Faith and Order to undertake — i.e. one upon which the unity of Christians depended — and (2) if so, how should it be dealt with? Dean NELSON said that with regard to the first question, it was in fact a very important question in connection with the Episcopalian-Methodist union discussions now going on in the United States, because the Methodist Church had admitted women to its ministry. Professor D'ESPINE wanted to know whether the Church of Sweden wanted them to give a specific reply, and Mr. HOUSE pointed out that the introduction to the document produced by the Department of Co-operation stated on the first page that the report “was sent... to Archbishop Brilioth in late February,” so that from that point of view no further action was required.



The CHAIRMAN said it was necessary for the Working Committee to decide how it wanted to pursue the question. Dr. BILHEIMER thought it merited discussion as an issue which might very well become important for unity in the future, even if it was not a live issue at the moment. The idea that the Working Committee was concerned with Faith and Order questions in terms of unity was normative and should be the standard of judgment, but it was important to bear in mind those questions which might become live issues within the foreseeable future. He further reminded them that if neither the Dept. of Co-operation nor Faith and Order was in a position to deal with the question at the present moment, there was still a possibility that it could be carried on by the Division of Studies. Professor HARTFORD considered that there was little more that could usefully be done at the moment. The Dept. of Co-operation had gathered some very important data which would be available if the question were later to become a live issue for unity. But if they were to begin a full-scale study of the subject at the present time there was a danger that they would run into all sorts of difficulties, not least of which would be the problem of finding adequate resources. Dean NELSON supported Prof. Wingren and said that it was important that the Working Committee should not be concerned with Faith and Order only in its narrower sense. The problem would have to be dealt with sometime, and it appeared that here a start had already been made. If it was a question of *Amt* we need not be surprized to find that it was also a question of Christian unity. He suggested that a systematic study of the Ministry should be taken up, which would include the whole question of the ordination of women. Professor OSBORN suggested this might be put forward as a project to be taken up after 1963, if it was possible to wait that long.

After some further discussion it was decided that the question should be deferred until 1963 when the enlarged Commission would discuss the possibility of taking up the study (possibly in the wider form suggested by Dean Nelson) as a new project, with the proviso that if the Division of Studies thought it was too long to wait, it should be free to take up the question before then.

## (2) Faith and Order and Union Negotiations

As a preliminary, the CHAIRMAN read the relevant section from the draft Interim Report which the Committee on the Future of Faith and Order had drawn up and which was later to be discussed in full by the Working Committee ; explaining that he wanted the Committee in this discussion to examine as closely as possible all that was implied in this section of the Draft Report.

In his introduction Dean HORTON stressed that Faith and Order should first try to encourage unity between churches before any definite negotiations were entered into, and should secondly consider how best it could serve those who were already in the process of negotiations. He reminded the Committee that it was the churches which were the great centres of strength in the ecclesiastical world — not the National Christian Councils or the World Council. These churches had a mental picture of themselves, and also a mental picture of the other churches. The first task therefore was very often the destruction of this inherited mythological picture which the churches had of themselves and of each other. Ecumenical meetings, such as those at Amsterdam or Oberlin, had a great part to play at this point at the level of helping people to become acquainted with each other. For example, a Congregationalist who believes



that only in his own denomination can freedom be found, finds at a meeting such as these that Anglicans and Presbyterians are also speaking with obviously free minds, and thus he begins to revise his ideas. Smaller conferences were valuable for dealing with particular problems which arise and upon which the advice of Faith and Order is asked — as for example in the case of the question concerning the ordination of women.

But perhaps even more important than the work of the conferences was the work which could be done by the Faith and Order secretariat. The effect of keeping in personal contact with the chief people in each denomination was of extreme importance, and for this reason it was essential that as large a portion as possible of the budget should be devoted to the Secretary's travel. The Secretary had been in touch by correspondence with the National Christian Councils with excellent results, and it would be valuable if this could be extended to theological seminaries also. If regular contact were kept in this way it should not be difficult when the time came for actual negotiations between denominations for the Secretary to suggest that he might arrange for someone to sit in on their discussions. It should be remembered that during an actual negotiation the mood of the two parties was quite different. Breaks in such negotiations were not likely along denominational lines: they generally came between what might be termed those with "generous minds" and those with "less generous minds". Negotiating committees almost always succeeded, but the less generous got their reward when the document reached the stage of being sent down to the churches for discussion.

It was less easy to see the part that Faith and Order could play in this situation. It was true it could supply literature, and it could supply personnel. But the problems facing negotiators were not in general problems of theory — these would have already been worked out — but they were problems concerning the *mores* of the denominations, and it was just a simple fact that a person from outside could not possibly know these things. Dean Horton felt, however, that a representative of Faith and Order could make a symbolic witness, and there were certain times when such a person ought to be present in order to remind the negotiating bodies of the interest of the Church as a whole. For the most part, however, negotiating groups were working more on administrative and practical problems, and it was less easy to see what an outside person could do.

In the second introductory talk Professor HARTFORD referred to the merger of Faith and Order with Life and Work in the formation of the World Council of Churches. One of the main fears that had dominated Faith and Order was that entering the World Council would cause Christian opinion to settle down and accept the federation of the churches as a sufficient manifestation of unity, and would therefore not be disposed to proceed further towards that fuller conception of organic unity to which Faith and Order still felt the necessity to point. This danger was in fact present, but the World Council could not be entirely blamed for that; and it was essential that Faith and Order should continue to contain such people as Bishop Newbigin, Dean Nelson and the present Secretary to point continually towards the idea of unity. He was concerned, however, at the lack of understanding and concern for the question of unity which was shown by people in the churches. It was true, as Dean Horton had said, that conferences played a valuable part in teaching people to have an ecumenical concern, but they did not penetrate sufficiently deeply into the life of the churches.

The demand that all conferences should be attended only by officially appointed delegates was of vital concern to Faith and Order, because churches were afraid they might be committed to something important by a delegate who was not representative of his denomination. Other matters which caused concern were fears that members of the staff might be involved in political pronouncements, and that Faith and Order might become inhibited by its position in the World Council. Professor Hartford personally thought that Faith and Order was too much at the mercy of the Central Committee, because it was only represented by its officers, and possibly others if they should chance to be members of both.

So long as it was stressed that Faith and Order was willing to put its resources at the disposal of those engaged in union negotiations only *if asked* there should be no difficulty. As regards assistance by means of documents, the literature produced by Faith and Order was voluminous, but it was disappointing that it was not more available to the general public. There was much that was valuable for giving information to people who knew little and cared less about the ecumenical movement, and he regarded this as a particular task for each member of the Faith and Order Commission, not only to represent his church on the Commission, but also to represent Faith and Order to his own church.

In the discussion which followed, Professor FLOROVSKY stressed the fact that while the Orthodox Church was very sympathetic to all that was being done towards the unity of the Christian world, it would be very embarrassed by any participation or seeming participation on the part of Faith and Order in union negotiations if it were thought that such participation might be interpreted as committing the Orthodox Church to acquiescence in such unions. Current negotiations were sometimes based on principles which were unacceptable to the Orthodox Church, and it was clearly stated at Edinburgh that the Orthodox Church participated in the ecumenical movement only on the understanding that their convictions were not compromised in any way. Orthodox churches were disturbed by the fact that the Church of England was involved in discussions with the Russian Church, the Church of Scotland and the Methodist Church all at the same time. The position of the Orthodox representatives in Faith and Order Theological Commissions was becoming embarrassing and ambiguous and was bringing about undesirable repercussions in the churches. They therefore felt it necessary to issue this warning, and to state clearly that Orthodox churches could not continue to participate in Faith and Order work if Faith and Order were to take any part in promoting or advocating any particular union schemes or proposals, because their position would thus be compromised.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that none of the proposals suggested that Faith and Order could ever take part in promoting or advocating any particular scheme of union, and indeed, if such were the intention, then not only the Orthodox, but also Anglican and Lutheran churches would vote against it. It was clear that two different things were meant: an action, and the misunderstanding of that action. These were not to be confused. Professor HARTFORD asked what Professor Florovsky's reaction would be supposing two negotiating churches asked Faith and Order to send an Orthodox observer to sit in on their discussions, and Faith and Order then invited Professor Florovsky to go in this capacity. Professor FLOROVSKY replied that he would refer the matter to his church, and, if permission were granted, he would go as a delegate of his church

and not as a member of Faith and Order. Professor HARTFORD then suggested that the wording of the draft Report should be adjusted at the relevant place, if this would help the Orthodox churches.

Professor WINGREN recalled Bishop Newbigin's words concerning neutrality and the nature of the unity being sought. These words were important, but they might well raise a difficulty for the Lutheran churches. Union schemes now in progress were being formulated on a basis of order — i.e. the combining of the orders of the individual churches taking part in the union. From the Lutheran point of view, union could be achieved even if orders were to remain different — hence the Lutherans were now finding themselves to be more open and diverse than the united churches now coming into being. As a result, they sometimes had the impression that they were being pressed to become narrower than they were, and this was likely to evoke repercussions from among some Lutheran churches, particularly in Germany. To avoid this, he suggested it might be better if Faith and Order were to keep to the position of neutrality and not become a party to union negotiations. Dean HORTON commented that many people who were not Lutherans would agree with Professor Wingren and accept his presuppositions.

Dr. HARMS said that he did not think Bishop Newbigin had been advocating any definite form or scheme of union. He thought his intention had been to say that whatever scheme was put forward Faith and Order could not be neutral over against the fact that the church is disunited, and that it had an obligation to work for the unity of the Church, whatever that unity might be. Bishop Newbigin had been merely stressing that the World Council had no reason to exist at all were it not for the fact that the churches are in fact disunited, and it was necessary to keep stressing the need to be concerned that the unity of the Church might be made visible. This was all Bishop Newbigin had meant, and Dr. Harms did not consider that any Lutheran could be neutral at the point put forward by Professor Wingren. The difficulty only arose if Faith and Order became allied with any particular scheme.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that in view of this misunderstanding a preliminary paragraph should be added to the draft Interim Report, making the point as clear as possible. This was agreed. Professor WINGREN still expressed doubts, however, concerning the danger of Faith and Order becoming committed to a particular viewpoint concerning any specific scheme; and Dr. VAJTA further enlarged on this point by explaining that the fear which Lutherans felt was in connection with the facile agreement on doctrine so often expressed in union schemes. Real difficulties arose when it came to the question of the ministry, where discussions were chiefly concerned with the way in which different orders were to be combined, while the Lutheran stress on preaching which they regarded as no less important than the ministry, received less attention. The problem to be faced was not so much how Faith and Order was to define its new attitude, but how it would work out in practice. He would like to see a practical implementation of this principle which would avoid any actual dangers of the sort that had been enumerated.

Dean HORTON asked whether it was only the question of consultants at union negotiations which would cause difficulty, and in his reply Dr. VAJTA stressed the danger of misinterpretation which would occur if Faith and Order were to be represented by consultants at such negotiations. The CHAIRMAN



stressed that a distinction should be made between the rightness and the expediency of any given course of action.

Professor D'ESPINE considered that a very important step was being envisaged. What Dean Horton had said about action in the churches was extremely important, but it raised a delicate problem concerning the line Faith and Order's future activity should take. There was a danger (to which Professor Florovsky had drawn attention) of Faith and Order taking a course of action with which the Orthodox churches could not associate themselves. Was Faith and Order prepared to pass on from being a place of meeting to a stage where it took action? The draft Interim Report stated that Faith and Order could not be neutral, and that it was an obligation on the part of the World Council to try to reach a conception of unity which was agreeable to the will of God. It should be remembered in this connection that for many member churches the World Council itself already represented that unity, and no further manifestation was required. Bishop Newbigin had said that this was a wrong conception of unity, but many churches considered it a right point of view: and if Faith and Order were to continue on these lines some modification of the Toronto Statement would be required.

Principal CHANDRAN, while agreeing that some account should be taken of the fears expressed by the Orthodox and Lutheran churches, at the same time considered that the neutrality to which Faith and Order was committed should be qualified. The task of Faith and Order was the proclamation of the oneness in Christ. It was therefore essential that Faith and Order should know what was happening in the churches. The movement towards union was a fruit of the Faith and Order movement, and since the churches were now beginning to come together Faith and Order could not stand aloof as a spectator. Faith and Order's work might well, however, be in the field of study rather than the field of action. What was required was a clarification of the neutrality to which it was committed. Was it a positive or a negative one?

Dr. BILHEIMER asked for further information from the point of view of the staff. If Faith and Order's position was to press for a churchly unity while at the same time remaining neutral as to what that churchly unity might mean in regard to any given scheme, this would mean maintaining a very tangible comprehensiveness in its work. This would involve making it very clear that all attempts at unity were part of its concern. Real comprehensiveness would mean that Faith and Order would have to give genuine evidence that it took the critics of a scheme quite as seriously as it did its advocates. This presumably was what Professor Wingren wished to ensure, and it was necessary to see that this concern had a place in Faith and Order's programme, by organizing something both for the negotiators of a union as well as for those who were critical of them. Could not the maintenance of neutrality include this kind of comprehensiveness?

Professor OSBORN thought the draft Interim Report might be strengthened if it were to make explicit that participation in a particular union discussion was an obligation on the part of Faith and Order for the proper fulfilment of its work and did not imply anything as to the nature of the union being negotiated. Tied explicitly to the situation in this way, it would help to answer critics. With regard to what Bishop Newbigin had said about neutrality, he thought the Chairman had provided a valuable statement in the draft Interim Report on



this point, but he would like to see something further said about Bishop Newbiggin's definition of "churchly unity."

Dr. HARMS pointed out that if a request came for a Faith and Order representative to be sent to attend a particular union negotiation, it was essential that Faith and Order should be able to send someone, as the refusal to do so would be a breach of neutrality.

Professor D'ESPINE pointed out the difficulties the Secretary might find when acting as Faith and Order representative in such cases. It must be remembered that as an individual he belonged to a particular church or tradition and as such would have a particular theological outlook which would necessarily colour any contribution he made to the discussion. How could he undertake so delicate a task when his personal views would inevitably be interpreted or misinterpreted as being those of Faith and Order? Mr. HOUSE emphasized this point, giving two illustrations from his own recent experience. Professor WINGREN said that if a representative were asked for from Faith and Order it would be specifically because of his connection with the World Council and because of his special knowledge and experience. Dean HORTON queried the wisdom of Faith and Order being represented by its secretary in all cases, and the SECRETARY pointed out that this certainly need not necessarily be so. Much depended upon the negotiating churches and what they wanted. But the fact that a difficult and delicate situation was caused by this question did not necessarily mean that Faith and Order could or should abdicate responsibility. It was necessary that attempts should go on to find a solution, even at the risk of misunderstanding. Mr. BARTLETT agreed that there would almost inevitably be some misinterpretation, but thought that if great care were exercised it should be possible to reach a solution. Professor FLOROVSKY pointed out that Faith and Order could not be a party to any negotiation because it was not a church. If one individual were sent he would not represent a general view, but a particular one — not necessarily his own — and in that sense could not be neutral. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that strictly a person could only become a "representative" if he were formally appointed by the Working Committee. A person not so appointed would be in a much more informal position. Dr. BILHEIMER said the person to be appointed would probably have to be decided upon in the first place by the Chairman and the Secretary, and considered that the more formally he was appointed and the more strongly his position as a representative was conceived, the more difficult the position would become. In such a case he could do no more than say "I can pass no value judgments on what you are doing."

Dr. VAJTA felt that misinterpretation had to be faced sometimes, but his previous remarks had been mainly intended to underline the fact that when such people were sent to take part in discussions it was quite essential that they should be clear in their own minds what they were doing. Very careful instructions would have to be given to them. Mr. BARTLETT queried the use of the word "offering" in connection with the sending of representatives, and thought it should be left to the inviting authority to choose the form of wording of the invitation. If the original initiative were thus left in the hands of the churches in the first place, much misinterpretation might be avoided. Professor OSBORN agreed with Dr. Harms that it would be very unfortunate if Faith and Order were unable to send a representative or advise on the choice of one when asked to do so, as he considered it would be a most valuable service.

Dean NELSON then expressed some surprise at the caution being shown by members of the Working Committee as though this were an entirely new proposal. He went on to explain that during his term of office as Secretary he had acted as a representative on several occasions. Dean Horton, for example, had invited him to be present at the union meetings of his own Church, and he had never heard that anyone was offended by his action.

Professor FLOROVSKY then asked to go on record in the minutes, in the names of himself and Professor KONSTANTINIDIS, to point out that the Orthodox Churches would be opposed to Faith and Order promoting or advocating any particular scheme of unity. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that no such action as that was envisaged, but that the Orthodox objection to any such possibility should be recorded. The CHAIRMAN then went on to say that there would be further discussion of this subject when the Future Committee's draft Interim Report came up on the agenda.

### (3) Week of Prayer for Christian Unity

The discussion was introduced by Dr. HARMS, who said that the question of the dates fixed for the Week of Prayer had often been discussed in the past, and it had always been agreed that there should be no change, for whatever week was chosen was bound to be inconvenient for some groups of people.

This year, however, there was a different reason for wishing to draw the Committee's attention to the matter, since it was something which might have consequences for future procedure. It could be seen from the documents before the Committee that some of the material issued for the Week of Prayer in January 1958 had been directed almost entirely towards prayer for the submission of non-Catholics to the Roman Church. Dr. Harms also quoted various articles which had been written by Roman Catholics criticizing the Couturier understanding of the Week of Prayer.

This gave rise to the question of what the World Council's practice and attitude should be. Dr. Harms said that when he had been in Rome he had discussed the idea of changing the time of the Week of Prayer owing to these difficulties; but the reaction from the Catholics had been to urge very strongly that the observance of the Week of Prayer at the same time in January should continue. Personally, Dr. Harms himself did not want to change the dates, but it was, therefore, necessary for Faith and Order to be very clear what they were doing. He thought it would be possible to continue with a good conscience, provided the position was made quite clear to the churches, and it was understood that we were aware of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN, in thanking Dr. Harms for his report, commented that this more extreme view on the part of Roman Catholicism had also been reflected in the observance of the Week of Prayer in Britain. Some Catholic sources which had in the past circulated Couturier material for the Week of Prayer no longer did so, but it was difficult to measure the extent of this trend.

Professor FLOROVSKY, in the discussion which followed, asked whether the Week of Prayer was observed in Greece, and in reply Professor KONSTANTINIDIS said that there was some observance amongst Orthodox church members, particularly in Athens University circles, but no official participation on the part of the Orthodox Church. In Constantinople a clear distinction was made between

the Roman Catholic Octave emphasizing prayer that all might return to Rome, and other approaches. He stressed, however, that the Orthodox Church regularly prays for unity at each celebration of the Liturgy, and thus sees less need for a special Week of Prayer.

Professor D'ESPINE, after briefly outlining what had happened to the Abbé Couturier's work since his death, stressed the difficulties in gaining support for the Week of Prayer in the Latin countries of Europe, and was asked by Professor KONSTANTINIDIS whether in consequence he felt it was justifiable to attempt to continue this. In his reply Professor D'ESPINE said that he did not necessarily draw that conclusion, but had merely tried to suggest reasons for the extremely small support given to the Week of Prayer in the Latin countries, and added that in such countries it often seemed far more natural for Protestants to observe the Week of Prayer sponsored by the Evangelical Alliance which fell slightly earlier in the year.

Dr. KENNEDY drew attention to the difficulty caused in America by the many different weeks of prayer which the churches were called upon to support. This caused much confusion, and was partly the reason why the Week of Prayer in January did not have a greater following, although much work was being done in this respect. Principal CHANDRAN referred to the great diversity of concepts concerning unity in the minds of those who prayed for the unity of the Church: not only Catholics had a fixed idea of what they meant when they prayed for unity. There was much to be done in teaching people what was involved in asking that God's will might be done with regard to the unity of the Church. Dr. SKOGLUND felt very strongly that the Week of Prayer was of very great importance, and hoped that some way might be found of bringing the idea down to a more popular level, so that it could get into the thinking of the people in the churches. In many Protestant churches at least, it was still something very remote from the average person. The CHAIRMAN, while agreeing with this, said that popularization was essentially a national task. Professor TAYLOR referred to the passage in Romans 8: 26 — "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit. . . maketh intercession for us" — and said it seemed clear that all our prayer would in some sense be faulty, and therefore we could only pray in the understanding that the Holy Spirit would correct what was amiss in our prayer.

The CHAIRMAN said he thought there should not be too much anxiety about the fact that this kind of prayer was not really understood. So much could not be done unless a certain amount of Christian insight had been obtained. The observation of the Week of Prayer in depth rather than extent (for which there was considerable evidence) was something to be grateful for. It was possible to rejoice that these difficulties were placed in the way of our prayer spiritually and made it more costly, because they corresponded to the reality of our situation and helped us to see how far we had to go. In prayer we inevitably had some preconceived idea in our minds as to how our prayer would be answered, but if we concentrated on God and on prayer for his will to be done then the Holy Spirit in whom our prayer was made was able to transcend our intention and make it acceptable before God.

Mr. BARTLETT expressed the hope that it would be possible to accept what the Chairman had said. He then proposed that *Dr. Harms* be thanked for his past and present work in connection with Roman Catholics and the Week of



Prayer ; and this was agreed. Dr. SKOGLUND suggested that an article might be written for the *Ecumenical Review* on the lines of Dr. Harms's review of the present position.

The CHAIRMAN then proposed that the Committee re-confirm the tradition of sending out literature for the Week of Prayer at the same time of year as in the past, suggesting that such literature should make it clear that although we were not ignorant of Roman Catholic views it was nevertheless felt that the previous practice should be continued, in view of our belief that God would accept all prayers. The Chairman added that members would have to be ready and prepared to defend this decision, but it seemed right that there should be no change of practice. He thought it should be possible to say in words that were proper to an act of prayer that we were aware of the problem created by observing the Week of Prayer at the same time as the Roman Catholic Octave of Prayer ; and that while it was necessary to consider seriously the facts concerning Roman Catholic observance of the Week in a form which made non-Catholics unhappy, we had nevertheless decided to continue and encourage the observance of this Week. Professor HARTFORD urged that nothing be said on the prayer leaflet which might seem inappropriate to the context of actual prayer. The CHAIRMAN explained that the introduction on the leaflet would be speaking of the question on terms of a spiritual problem — about the difficulty of having different ideas of what one prays for, and of how in offering the will to God one partakes of the mystery inherent in the nature of prayer through the Holy Spirit.

The CHAIRMAN's proposal concerning re-confirmation of the decision to continue observance of the Week of Prayer during the period 18-25 January was then agreed.

## 11. REPORT OF OBERLIN CONFERENCE

Reporting on this Conference Dr. KENNEDY stressed the very great importance and value of the preparatory work, which was one of its most notable features. By means of this preparatory work groups of people in all parts of the country had been reached who did not normally take part in such conferences. The Conference was also of value because it was so widely representative : some churches participated which had not previously been concerned in ecumenical discussion. There was a very wide range, from Seventh Day Baptists to Episcopalians, and many found that they learned much from those traditions differed most widely from their own.

The Conference had been designed with three main aims in mind : (1) to bring together the results of earlier significant developments in the movement towards unity in the churches, (2) to extend knowledge of the North American situation, and (3) to project lines of ecumenical study which might become most fruitful in the years ahead. Of these objectives, the last two seemed to have had most success in attaining fulfilment. The second one in particular was for many people the big fact of the conference, and meant that for the first time a deeper understanding of the present situation in the churches was achieved.

With regard to results, a very important one was the recommendation made to the National Council of Churches that a department should be set up to



encourage the study of Faith and Order questions and to help in spreading such study in other parts of the country. This might have far-reaching consequences.

In the discussion which followed upon this report, Dean NELSON recommended that the published Report of the Conference be distributed to all non-American members of the Faith and Order Commission and the Theological Commissions. He believed that the decision of the National Council of Churches to further Faith and Order study by appointing an Advisory Committee and a full-time director for Faith and Order work was a milestone, and represented a real about-face for many of the churches. A substantial sum had been voted for a year's work on Faith and Order study. Dean Nelson ended by saying how glad he was that this had happened, and welcomed so encouraging a report. The CHAIRMAN agreed that the Working Committee would wish to record its satisfaction at receiving the report of this decision and would wish the project well. He then went on to ask whether it would be necessary for the Working Committee to take any decision about its relationship to this new body. The SECRETARY said that as a result of a conversation he had had with Dr. Roswell Barnes the only question at the moment was whether it would be possible for the newly-appointed director to sit in on meetings of the Faith and Order Theological Commissions when invited. It was agreed that this should be possible, and Professor TAYLOR wondered whether he might be able to attend meetings of the Working Committee, since it was important that he should know about Faith and Order from the inside. Professor OSBORN also supported this, and the CHAIRMAN pointed out that under Clause 12 of the Constitution it would be possible to invite such a person to attend if necessary.

## 12. RELATIONS WITH MOSCOW PATRIARCHATE

*Metropolitan James of Melita*, Representative of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, was present.

The Rev. FRANCIS HOUSE gave a brief résumé of the history of the relations between the World Council of Churches and the Moscow Patriarchate since the war, and more particularly since 1955. He then reported that after many delays a meeting had been arranged to take place in Utrecht from August 7-9, 1958, to be attended by three representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church and three representatives of the World Council. These conversations would be mainly of an exploratory nature, and would discuss the making of contacts. In response to questions, Mr. House also gave detailed information concerning the agenda for this meeting.

In the discussion which followed, Bishop JAMES commented that what had caused Metropolitan Nicolai and the Russian Church to consider more favourably the possibility of holding this meeting was the recent attitude of the World Council towards the present world situation. At the forthcoming meetings only questions concerning possible co-operation would be discussed, and not questions of Faith and Order; and Bishop James urged that there should not be too much optimism concerning the outcome of these talks. Nonetheless, if contact of some kind could be made now, there was always the hope of extending it later.

Professor FLOROVSKY considered it was possible to take a more optimistic view. He had the impression that there was a definite change of outlook within the Russian Church, and a genuine interest in the western world. Dr. SKOGLUND asked whether any approach had been made to the Baptist Church in Russia, to which Mr. HOUSE replied that while no definite arrangements had been made, it had been stated that the meeting with the Orthodox representatives would be followed by meetings with the Baptist and other churches in Russia. It was a little complicated as several churches were involved. In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. HOUSE also drew the Working Committee's attention to the fact that an English translation had now been made of an article by Professor Schlink in *Kerygma und Dogma* on "The Ecumenical Contribution of the Russian Orthodox Church", written as a result of his recent visit to Russia.

### 13. PREPARATIONS FOR THE THIRD ASSEMBLY

Dr. BILHEIMER gave a brief outline of the plans which were in process of being made for the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches to be held in Ceylon in 1961. The Assembly was of special significance firstly because by being held in Ceylon it focused the attention of the churches on the situation in Asia, and secondly because it would see the integration of the International Missionary Council with the World Council. It was hoped to try and make the Assembly an integrated part of the whole process of the life of the churches, and not merely an isolated event; and as part of this aim it was planned to have the work of the Assembly in three main sections dealing respectively with the Church as called to *unity*, to *witness* and to *service* in the world. Each of these three sections would be planned by a preparatory commission consisting of members of the Working Committees of the various Departments. It was intended that in each section the concerns of the other two should also receive consideration, and this meant that the preparatory commission for each of the three sections would be composed of representatives from each Working Committee. Each Working Committee would therefore divide its membership among each of the three preparatory commissions. The first meeting of these preparatory commissions would be in 1959 and the second in 1960. Their main work would be to prepare documents for widespread use in the churches as well as for the delegates to the Assembly.

Several members wished to raise questions concerning the content of the proposed method of study at the Assembly and felt that in their present form the draft proposals did not give sufficient emphasis to the Faith and Order aspect of the concern for unity.

Professor WINGREN, in referring to the questions set for discussion in each section, pointed out that "unity" in this context could not be dealt with in the same way as "witness" and "service". Professor OSBORN suggested the use of the word "manifest" but Principal CHANDRAN objected that "manifest" was too weak, although "achievement" was too strong. Professor D'ESPINE pointed out that this brought up once again the question raised by Professor Florovsky regarding the way in which unity was manifested. There was a certain ambiguity in the use of the term "given unity": it was necessary to distinguish between what was already given and what was still lacking. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there was also a further distinction between those elements of our given

unity which were acknowledged as given (e.g. our faith in Christ) and those elements of our given unity which were not accepted as such, and which were therefore part of our disunity (e.g. the Roman view of the manifest unity in Peter, which some would recognize but not others). Dr. BILHEIMER asked in what sense the "given" element in unity differed from the "given" element in mission. Professor WINGREN said that the Church was based upon the fact that mission was given to it, but that the similarity of structure between the two conceptions was only a very limited one.

The CHAIRMAN said that the main point at issue was whether the other two elements "witness" and "service" were also "tasks" in the same sense as unity was, and suggested that it would be interesting to relate the question to the *notae ecclesiae* of the Creeds, which were both gifts and tasks. It was also necessary for the Working Committee to satisfy itself that the Assembly could be a vehicle for expressing Faith and Order work in the way they wished it to be done. He pointed out that by the time the membership of the Faith and Order Working Committee was scattered throughout three preparatory committees, there would be a considerable dilution of Faith and Order interests, and they might well not be effectively represented: and went on to suggest that it might be helpful if those of the Working Committee who were also members of the Central Committee would raise these concerns there. He then pointed out that the preparatory committees, or "reorganized working committees" provided a valuable opportunity for getting some theological content into the work of the Assembly. The discussion on Baptism, for example, might well be one of the themes dealt with by these committees and put before the Assembly as part of their work.

Professor KONSTANTINIDIS found it difficult to see the relation between the work of the Faith and Order Commission and that of the Assembly. The relation of the Orthodox to the Commission was clear, but it was not at all clear what their relationship would be to the particular section on unity proposed for the Assembly. He thought it might be difficult to persuade the Orthodox churches to accept the proposals as now outlined, precisely because it was not clear where Faith and Order work began and ended. The matter was further complicated by the question of the integration of the International Missionary Council. Professor FLOROVSKY agreed, and thought that the Orthodox churches might refuse to send delegates, since the question was being framed as a practical problem rather than as a theological one. Professor WINGREN reminded the Committee that there had always been sections in past assemblies to deal with both practical and theological questions. If the section on unity were treated more theologically the position would be much easier. Professor FLOROVSKY pointed out, however, that the shift of emphasis in these proposals was very radical and likely to change the whole character of the Assembly. There was a great danger that Faith and Order work would not be represented at all. The questions to be answered were so formulated as not to require a theological answer. Dr. BILHEIMER thought that none of the preparatory committees would be able to go very far without using Faith and Order material for primary sources. He considered that the Faith and Order Commission meeting in 1960 would provide an opportunity for bringing the work of the Theological Commissions before the Assembly. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Working Committee that half of the Assembly would be devoted to receiving the reports of the sections. The SECRETARY pointed out that the difficulty referred



to by Professor Florovsky and Professor Konstantinidis was not confined to the Orthodox: many other churches felt that the Assemblies had a methodology which operated in a way in which they could not contribute. He had experienced this in Indonesia, and it was a question which Faith and Order should investigate.

The CHAIRMAN emphasized that the Committee had a duty to see that the Assembly adequately reflected the work of Faith and Order. In order to ensure that the mind of the whole Working Committee was properly represented at the preparatory committee meetings it would be more satisfactory to have a stronger element (one-half instead of one-third) in the committee dealing with the section on unity. This suggestion met with general agreement.

Professor D'ESPINE then raised the question of the function of the 1960 meeting of the Faith and Order Commission in relation to the Assembly, and Dean HORTON urged that its work should be closely related to the Assembly preparations. Professor HARTFORD reminded the Committee that one of the main tasks of the Commission was to receive the reports of the Theological Commissions: this was a very important function. The CHAIRMAN stated that the triennial meeting was the traditional way in which Faith and Order concerns were brought before the Assembly, so that in a sense plans for the 1960 Commission meeting were merely another aspect of Assembly preparation. The Commission was being asked to "permeate" the whole of the Assembly with its work. Therefore the 1960 meeting must not only be concerned with receiving reports, but must also originate the new lines of thought for the work of the Theological Commissions which would then be put up to the Assembly for authorization and come into practice in 1963.

Professor D'ESPINE said it was important to regard the Assembly as an opportunity for showing how Faith and Order work was progressing, and suggested that for the 1960 meeting the secretariat should prepare a printed Progress Report which could be discussed and form the basis of a major report to the Assembly. He added that a printed report was not in itself sufficient at the Assembly, since it was necessary to take into account the fact that very few of the delegates were likely to have read it. It was therefore necessary to press for a survey of the results of Faith and Order work to be presented orally at the Assembly as well. Dr. BILHEIMER reminded the Committee that in 1960 the second of the preparatory joint committees for the Assembly would be held to complete the preliminary work, and suggested that if the Commission could arrange to meet before the preparatory committees and look at the plans made in 1959, this would strengthen the influence of Faith and Order in the preparatory section on unity. The CHAIRMAN wondered if it would be possible to hold the Commission meeting in conjunction with those of the preparatory and working committees, but Professor WINGREN thought it preferable to have the Faith and Order Commission meeting earlier. No decision was reached.

#### 14. NEW PROJECTS

##### (1) Faith and Order Digest

The SECRETARY recalled the suggestion made by Bishop Dun at the meeting of the Faith and Order Commission the previous year that a Digest should be prepared which would gather together findings of past ecumenical conferences in a more readily available form: and explained how he had now put together



a small specimen section on Baptism to give the Committee some idea of what the Digest might look like. The whole Digest would be made up of sections on various subjects, indexed so that enquirers could find out what agreements had been reached on any given subject. Past agreements were frequently forgotten, and it was difficult for a newer generation to know exactly what agreements had been reached. In this specimen section a distinction had been made between reports approved by Faith and Order Conferences, those approved by Faith and Order Theological Commissions and conference preparatory groups, and official statements of the World Council; and there was also a suggestion that background materials might be included. The Working Committee was asked for advice on this method. The Secretary also queried the value of merely quoting excerpts from statements, since it was very difficult to convey the full sense of a statement in short paragraphs quoted apart from their context without doing damage to the argument. He instanced this in connection with the Working Paper on Baptism.

The CHAIRMAN asked several questions concerning the cost of the project. Many of the sections could be compiled from material available in the office, and it would be necessary to have some idea of how much was needed for inclusion. Professor HARTFORD thought the cost would be heavy, and it was suggested by the CHAIRMAN that a sample or descriptive leaflet might be sent round to various libraries inviting them to subscribe, since the only other possibility for obtaining the necessary funds would be by means of a donation offered as a launching sum. There was also the problem of language; unless the Digest were issued in three languages its circulation in Europe would be extremely limited. Further questions were asked about the topics to be included, and Dean NELSON thought that the section on background materials might be excluded since it could well be capable of almost indefinite extension and thus make the whole thing too unwieldy. Dean HORTON suggested a cumulative index to the bound volumes of official conference reports might meet the need more effectively than the Digest, but Dean NELSON pointed out that Bishop Dun, the originator of the idea, had been thinking in terms of something that would help in the preparations for the next Assembly. The CHAIRMAN thought that if possible someone else should be found to prepare the Digest, since the Secretary really had no time for this in addition to his other work. Dean NELSON suggested that either Dr. DeGroot or possibly Dr. Floyd Tomkins might be asked to help in this connection. After further discussion, the Working Committee agreed that while the idea of the Digest was a good one and worthy of support, they saw no immediate prospect of having the staff and financial resources for carrying it out. It was nevertheless recommended that Dr. DeGroot and Dr. Floyd Tomkins might be approached as likely people who might undertake this work.

## (2) Faith and Order Reporter

The SECRETARY explained that this was an idea which had arisen out of a desire to make the Faith and Order Commission more of a working body. It was intended to bring before the members documents on certain topics of importance which might not be suitable for circulation among a larger group. It raised again to some extent the question of Faith and Order and union negotiations, though chiefly from the point of view of information. A covering

letter sent out with the first batch of such documents had asked recipients to give their opinions on the value of this scheme, and several letters had been received welcoming the project. Whether it could continue, however, depended to some extent on how far members of the Commission were willing to contribute to it, and how far those engaged in union negotiations would be prepared to share their experience. He asked for comments from the Working Committee.

Professor TAYLOR thought the scheme was particularly valuable as a means of keeping contact with members of the Commission during the three-year period between meetings. Dean NELSON thought it also valuable as a means of eliciting information, particularly if the Secretary were to pose specific questions in each of his covering letters. Replies could from time to time be collected and filed, and used to provide valuable information. Professor OSBORN wondered whether the circulation might not be extended — on a subscription basis if necessary — to cover other interested persons, such as past Commission members, or those who attended Commission and Working Committee meetings as substitutes. Such people were very often anxious to keep up their contacts with the work of Faith and Order, and this would be a valuable way of doing so. Dr. BILHEIMER instanced in this connection the Department of Church and Society's publication *Background Information* which had a circulation of about 2,000. It contained a certain amount of controversial material, and he thought Faith and Order might consider something of this kind, since people were more willing to write freely for an informal journal than for a more official publication. The SECRETARY said that it was for this reason he was unwilling to extend the circulation in the way Professor Osborn had envisaged, since it would be easier to get people to write for a small group whose names they knew. Mr. BARTLETT suggested that such material might be valuable as the basis of group discussions held under the auspices of the National Councils of Churches. The SECRETARY said it was hoped that the distribution of such semi-confidential materials might help Commission members to see the responsibility of their position and to keep them in more regular touch with Faith and Order work. Professor TAYLOR suggested that mailings of such material should be at least twice a year. Dean NELSON raised the question of the relationship of this project to the Division of Studies *Bulletin*, and asked whether this latter might not meet the need mentioned by Professor Osborn. In response to a question from the Chairman, Dr. BILHEIMER said the circulation of the *Bulletin* was between 1,300 and 1,800 and he would like to see this greatly increased. The material put out by the Faith and Order Reporter was in a sense complementary to that published in the *Bulletin*.

After some further discussion it was **agreed** that the experiment was worth continuing, at least until the next Assembly, and the Secretary was **authorized** to continue with it until then.

### (3) Proposal for a Consultation on Unity

The SECRETARY briefly outlined a suggestion which had been made for a consultation on unity to discuss possible steps which might be taken in the next few years. Dr. BILHEIMER thought such a plan might be valuably linked with the preparations for the forthcoming Assembly and suggested that the Secretariat should be authorized to prepare a consultation of people engaged in union negotiation in connection with the meeting in 1960. The SECRETARY

explained that his original idea had been to draw together people dealing with questions of unity, including those not officially connected with Faith and Order. The CHAIRMAN thought the discussion might well be linked with that on the Toronto Statement. Dr. BILHEIMER agreed since what the Secretary had in mind seemed to be connected with the basic drive for unity which the Committee had been discussing. But rather than relate the discussion to the Toronto Statement it might perhaps be better to consider writing a new document discussing what the World Council meant when it spoke about "unity." This would then become part of Faith and Order's contribution to the pre-Assembly discussions, since the main concern of Faith and Order might well be to urge that the Assembly should reconsider seriously the question of what was meant by "unity." Professor FLOROVSKY pointed out that although many in the World Council like Bishop Newbigin would plead for more clarity on the subject of unity, it was nevertheless quite clear that among the member churches of the World Council widely different conceptions were held, so that the adoption of any one view of unity would embarrass those who did not share it. It might also lead to the formation of different blocs of opinions in the World Council which would lead to the disruption of the ecumenical fellowship. Professor WINGREN thought the difficulties of coming to an agreement about what was meant by unity were considerable, but asked whether it was not possible in practice to work together while still holding different views. Principal CHANDRAN stressed (as Bishop Newbigin had done) the need to keep before the churches a goal beyond mere co-operation. There was a real danger of making ecumenism a substitute for unity, and consequently a need to redefine the principle of neutrality to which the World Council was committed. Dean HORTON thought that Bishop Newbigin was being misinterpreted: while he had stressed that the World Council could not be neutral about the desire for unity, he had not intended to give up the idea of neutrality as between one plan and another. Professor HARTFORD proposed that Bishop Newbigin be asked to prepare a memorandum on this question for next year's meeting. The SECRETARY thought the discussion was not answering the question of whether it was possible to continue working within the framework of a dynamic neutrality.

Professor TAYLOR emphasized the need for a retrospective look at the road which the ecumenical movement had traversed. Thus there was need of a new statement to take stock of Faith and Order's present position and to find out what it was possible to say together about unity before considering any further step. Dean NELSON suggested that the question could be discussed with Bishop Newbigin at a session of the Future Committee with some staff members. Professor HARTFORD stressed that the question of the unity of the Church was not one for Faith and Order alone, but was also the concern of the whole World Council. It was not possible to be content with the unity achieved so far in the World Council, for full unity had clearly not been achieved, only some degree of fellowship. Mr. BARTLETT thought the danger was chiefly one of conceiving unity in merely constitutional terms.

Various further suggestions were put forward, and Professor FLOROVSKY asked whether it was intended that this new document should be regarded as integrally related to the Toronto Statement or not; to which the CHAIRMAN replied that it was intended not as a redraft of the Toronto Statement but as a document which would answer the question for the present time as the Toronto Statement had done for its time. Dr. BILHEIMER suggested that the Future Com-



mittee be asked to give serious consideration to the terms in which the discussion could be continued.

The CHAIRMAN then proposed that the Future Committee be given the task of (1) redefining the issue of how unity was to be understood in the present ecumenical situation (this discussion to be initiated by a paper from Bishop Newbigin), and (2) considering how the discussion could best be continued. This proposal was **agreed**.

## 15. BAPTISM STUDY

The SECRETARY reminded the Committee of the recommendation made at the meeting of the Faith and Order Commission in New Haven that the Working Committee and the European Section of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church should continue the study, and report to the Commission again in 1960. He then went on to report that the European Section was in fact continuing the study, and a paper by Professor Torrance was to be discussed at this year's meeting of the Section at Lund. Professor FLOROVSKY observed that the question of Baptism had been discussed at the Oberlin Conference, and suggested that the Conference's Report on this subject might be studied by the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church. Dean NELSON urged that the European Section should deal with the questions raised on the Working Paper by the Commission at Yale. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Working Committee that this study was not only the concern of the Theological Commission, but would also figure prominently in the programme of the Faith and Order Commission in 1960 and 1963.

## 16. STAFF, TRAVEL AND BUDGET

### (1) Staff

The CHAIRMAN outlined the situation regarding staff possibilities, and after a short discussion it was proposed and seconded that:

(a) *Dr. Keith Bridston* be invited to be Secretary to the Faith and Order Department until the Assembly of 1961, and

(b) an additional secretary be appointed if at all possible before the Third Assembly since the proposed programme of work is impossible without an increase.

### (2) Budget

The SECRETARY explained the items on the proposed budget for 1959. He appealed for extra money for meetings of the Theological Commissions since they worked on a very narrow budget and many members had to have help from their churches for their travel expenses, and in some cases had met expenses out of their own pockets. In response to a question he explained that the expenses of the Working Committee were charged on the Divisional Budget.

Principal CHANDRAN asked whether, in view of the fact that the East Asian Section of the Worship Commission had not been able to meet during the past year, the amount allowed for its expenses could be carried over to the following year. It was explained that under the present accounting system this was

very difficult, but Dr. BILHEIMER hoped that by classing Theological Commissions as "projects" a way might be found of enabling them to build up reserves for larger meetings.

Dean HORTON referred to the difficulties caused by economic differences between America and Europe which made it difficult for Americans with obligations in the United States to live in Europe. Dr. BILHEIMER said this was one of the chief problems being experienced by the World Council, and under the present method there appeared to be no solution, though the World Council were working on this.

After further discussion Dean HORTON asked that accounts should be submitted giving full details of income from all sources, since otherwise it was not possible to form a proper judgment of the situation. Mr HOUSE explained that hitherto the Finance Committee had been concerned exclusively with the normal budget and had not taken any account of special funds. It had now been agreed, however, that the Finance Department would produce statements showing both normal funds and special funds: and though there were still unsolved technical difficulties about obtaining a statement to cover both, it was hoped this situation would be improved by next year. Dr. BILHEIMER then explained in greater detail the system whereby it was hoped the Theological Commissions would be able to accumulate reserves over a period of a few years, and the scheme was further discussed. Mr. BARTLETT drew attention to the difficulties involved in meeting at a time of year before the heaviest expenses were incurred. There was also the difficulty of obtaining adequate information, in view of the fact that the actual responsibility for the budget was now in the hands of the Finance Committee.

After further discussion it was agreed that future financial statements should include an indication of all monies involved, either in expected income or expenditure, whether in the World Council budget or not.

### (3) Travel

The SECRETARY stated that he was aware, from what Dean Nelson had told him, of the importance of travel as part of the Secretary's work, and he was himself convinced of the truth of this. He pointed out, however, that the very small budget limited the Secretary's travel considerably. If it were at all possible, by means of money from other sources, he was very anxious to make contacts in areas which had not so far been covered by Dean Nelson — in particular Africa and South America. He had tentatively discussed the latter project with Bishop Barbieri, who had suggested that discussions on the theme of worship would make the best introduction to Faith and Order work in the area. Such projects as these were, however, quite out of the question on the present travel budget.

In the discussion which followed it was suggested that use might be made for this purpose of part of the Rockefeller grant earmarked for "regional development". Professor TAYLOR offered to make enquiries regarding the possibility of obtaining a grant for the South American project when he visited Mexico. Dr. BILHEIMER suggested that there was also a possibility of arranging an Asian visit in the spring of 1959.

The Working Committee agreed that the Secretary's travel to South America and to Africa should be regarded as a legitimate charge on the Rockefeller grant, if, after consultation with other authorities, it was considered that such a visit would be valuable for the area in question.

Dean HORTON asked that if such a visit were made, the Secretary would write and circulate a travel diary to the members of the Faith and Order Commission.

## 17. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE FUTURE OF FAITH AND ORDER

The CHAIRMAN welcomed *Dr. Visser 't Hooft*, General Secretary of the World Council, who was present for this discussion.

The CHAIRMAN then briefly introduced the Report and outlined its main structure. It was divided into three main sections:

- (A) a re-examination of the five functions of Faith and Order as outlined in the Constitution
- (B) further implications for future work
- (C) consequences for organization implied by such work

He went on to say that the common mind of the Committee on the Future was a general sense of concern to see that Faith and Order should have a position in the World Council which reflected its central rôle in the ecumenical movement, but that no specific recommendations had been made for fear of causing embarrassment to the World Council in its present situation. Nevertheless, the scale of operations envisaged certainly required a larger staff than at present.

It was decided to comment in detail on each section of the Report in order, so that it might become a Report from the Working Committee to the Central Committee.

### Section A

Dr. VISSER 'T HOOFT asked that the sentence in the first paragraph referring to neutrality should be amplified because of its importance. The question had never been clearly stated before, and it was important that this opportunity of doing so should be taken. He suggested that the Chairman should undertake this.

Professor WINGREN suggested that if "we" in the first paragraph referred to Faith and Order the question of an ecclesiology of the World Council arose once more. In reply the CHAIRMAN observed that in a document of this kind the reference was to those who had drawn it up, as responsible members of their own churches. This would not imply a particular ecclesiology. Dr. VISSER 'T HOOFT added that without having a particular ecclesiology the World Council could have certain ecclesiological principles.



Dr. VAJTA asked questions about the nature of the churchly unity referred to but after some discussion it was agreed that it was not necessary to explain this further in the document at the present stage.

Various further verbal amendments were made.

## Section B

With regard to the section on unity negotiations, discussion centred largely round the suggestion that Faith and Order should be empowered to send representatives to union negotiations if invited to do so. Professor KONSTANTINIDIS thought that the official representative should always be the Secretary, since by virtue of his post he would be the only neutral person who could be sent, representing Faith and Order rather than any particular confession. Dean NELSON disputed this, denying that the Secretary was the only person who could be neutral, and saying that if such a position were taken up it would prevent anyone else ever being sent. Professor KONSTANTINIDIS thought that certain churches might accept the Secretary as a representative where they would not accept anyone else. Professor FLOROVSKY wanted a closer and more accurate definition of the functions of a representative: it should be understood what it was he represented. Professor WINGREN thought that the main contribution of such a representative was the special knowledge and experience that he possessed.

Concerning the question of extending contacts with churches outside the World Council, some questions were raised regarding the extent to which Roman Catholic interest in Faith and Order was the work of certain individual Roman Catholic theologians rather than of the official Roman Catholic Church. Dr. HARMS pointed out that at each Faith and Order conference there had always been Roman Catholic observers with some official permission at least from the local hierarchy; but after further discussion the paragraph was rephrased.

With regard to the paragraph on the Protestant churches outside the World Council, Dr. VISSER 'T HOOFT commented that it might not necessarily be the case that Faith and Order was the right Department to make the first approach to them, and on a suggestion from Mr. HOUSE, the clause was re-worded to allow for the work of contact with such churches to be if necessary the responsibility of a department other than Faith and Order.

## Section C

Dr. VISSER 'T HOOFT expressed surprise at the lack of concrete suggestions made, and thought the Committee had been too modest. Even allowing for the financial difficulties which had been represented to them, he thought there were several things which they might have recommended, and made some suggestions. Professor FLOROVSKY pointed out that more would have been asked had the Committee not been urged very strongly to moderate its demands, and Dean NELSON said that if it was desired that the Committee should be more specific in its recommendations, they would want to say something further about organization.

It was agreed that the suggestions outlined by Dr. Visser 't Hooft be incorporated in the revised version of the Interim Report, and that the Committee

on the Future be asked to give further attention next year to the question of divisional status.

(The Interim Report as revised and presented to the Central Committee is printed as Appendix II to these Minutes.)

## 18. SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

A list of projected meetings covering the years 1959-63 was circulated \* Professor WINGREN urged that the "reorganized Working Committees" preparing for the Assembly should have a first meeting in the spring rather than wait for a whole year after the decision to hold them had been taken, since much preliminary work would be required. Mr. HOUSE stated that August 4-14, 1959 had been suggested for the meetings of the "reorganized Working Committees". It was planned to allow five days for the joint preparatory work and five days for the individual Working Committees for their own departmental business. The meeting place would probably be Villach in Austria, to allow a comparatively short journey to Rhodes for the meetings of the Central Committee (August 18-29). In 1960 the dates suggested were August 2-12, in Scotland, for the "reorganized Working Committees", immediately before the Central Committee meetings at St. Andrews (August 16-24).

Various other dates were suggested for the Faith and Order Working Committee, in 1959, since August was not convenient for the Chairman, but since no other dates were possible it was agreed that the Working Committee should meet with the "reorganized Working Committees" at the time and place already suggested. It was also decided that the joint meeting of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church should be held from July 20 - August 1 in order to allow members of the Commission who were also members of the Working Committee to attend both.

## 19. NATIONAL FAITH AND ORDER COMMITTEES

The SECRETARY gave a brief report on the correspondence he had had with National Councils of Churches to find out how many of them had Faith and Order Committees. The results had proved interesting, and he was anxious to investigate the position further and see whether it was possible to help to provide them with materials for study.

## 20. INTER-CONFESSIOAL CONSULTATIONS

(a) The SECRETARY reminded the Committee of previous discussions of the project of an Orthodox/non-Orthodox consultation, and asked for further guidance from the Committee. Professor KONSTANTINIDIS reported that in connection with the meeting of the Central Committee at Rhodes in 1959 there had been discussion of the possibility of holding a special theological meeting between Greek Orthodox representatives and certain members of the World Council. A small group was working on this suggestion and would report to the Central Committee in Denmark in August.

---

\* See Appendix III.

(b) Dr. HARMS reported that the question of the *Corpus Confessionum* raised by Professor Schlink at Davos was now to be taken up again with the world confessional organizations. This would also be reported on at the Central Committee meeting in Denmark.

## 21. YOUTH CONFERENCE

Professor D'ESPINE and Mr. HOUSE reported on the forthcoming European Ecumenical Youth Conference at Lausanne in 1960. Since it was hoped to discuss Faith and Order questions in this conference it was **agreed** that the Faith and Order Secretary should have a discussion about the programme with the Secretary of the Youth Department.

## 22. CHECK LIST OF FAITH AND ORDER PUBLICATIONS

Dean NELSON drew the attention of the Working Committee to the Check List of Faith and Order Commission Official Numbered Publications (Series 1, 1910-1948) which had been compiled by Professor A. T. DeGroot, the Honorary Archivist, and which was now available. The CHAIRMAN commented that this was a very great contribution to the published documentation of Faith and Order, and the Working Committee unanimously **agreed** in expressing appreciation and gratitude to *Professor DeGroot* for all the work which the preparation of the Check List had involved.

## 23. FAITH AND ORDER ARCHIVES

Dean NELSON reported that he had been able to obtain and have sent to the Geneva office four cartons of early Faith and Order material from Dr. Floyd Tomkins, some of which was very valuable. He then proposed the following motion :

“That the Working Committee, being advised of the intention of the Rev. Dr. Floyd W. Tomkins to spend a year in Geneva, ask him to give further service to the Faith and Order Commission by

(1) editing material for the digest of important statements which have been made in Faith and Order

(2) preparing for a permanent place in the World Council archives the historical publications and documents of the Faith and Order movement.”

which was **agreed** unanimously.

The Working Committee also recorded its thanks to *Dean Nelson* for his work in collecting these documents, and Dr. VISSER 'T HOOFT suggested that they should be collated with the Hodgson papers.

The CHAIRMAN then closed the meeting with prayer.



STUDY COMMISSION  
ON INSTITUTIONALISM

PROGRAM OF WORK

adopted at meeting of the Commission, Boston, June 1958

I. Aim and Scope of the Commission

As part of the World Council of Churches, the Study Commission on Institutionalism is vitally concerned with the unity and diversity of the Churches. The Faith and Order Movement has since 1937 moved towards an understanding of unity and division in sociological as well as doctrinal terms. A widening and more complex range of experience and a more inclusive framework of interpretation have emerged. Doctrinal discussions confront social and cultural factors; sociological discussions confront doctrinal factors. Exclusive use of any single perspective to understand problems of unity and division is largely a thing of the past.

The Commission faces a host of social and cultural factors affecting unity and diversity which entice the interest of its members. Some of these are, e.g., the ethos of a regional culture, class stratification, nationalism, racial segregation, small group consciousness, and patterns of ecclesiastical organization. Each of these has its distinctive relevance and importance for particular church relationships. Lacking the necessary resources to deal adequately with all these factors, the Commission had been obliged to narrow the scope of its work. The question of institutionalism has been chosen, not because it is always the most important, but because it is found in every situation to some significant degree.

The terms of reference for this study were defined in 1955 as follows :

“To make a study of institutionalism as it affects all churches, and in particular :

1. The self-criticism of churches by which they may see their own structures sociologically as well as theologically ;
2. The relations both positive and negative of the churches to each other in the ecumenical conversation ;
3. The pattern of church relations which is finding expression in the World Council of Churches as an institution.”

Further clarification has developed from the meetings of the Commission in 1957 and 1958. The work of the Commission has been enhanced by the discussions at the Faith and Order Commission meetings in New Haven, and the North American Conference on Faith and Order dealing with the nature of the unity we seek in 1957. Of special interest are the issues raised by Section Eight of that Conference dealing with the relations of God's ordering of the life of the Church to the shifting organizational forms of historical churches.

1. *The inseparability of doctrinal and sociological factors*

A common object, the Church, needs to be studied from the perspective of the theologian and that of the sociologist. Christian belief that the Church is instituted by God, and in some sense governed by His ordinances, does not constitute any barrier to the

sociological study of the Church and its organization in history. A belief that these are given by God should engage the interest of the serious scholar who desires to see how these institutions operate in history and how they influence and are influenced by the surrounding social and cultural phenomena.

Certain functions, e.g., preaching and the celebration of the sacraments, have had a relatively fixed form throughout the history of the Church. Other functions, e.g., evangelism and the governing of church life, have been executed through a greater variety of forms. The precise ways in which constant functions are realized in transient forms are by no means agreed upon by members of the Commission. It was agreed that a given quality of the Church's life must be constantly acknowledged, and the penetration of this into the organizational forms of the Church's life must be understood and admitted.

The Commission, however, accepts its major task to be that of viewing the Church from a sociological perspective. Its focus of attention is on the more flexible and socially relative patterns of the historical churches. To what extent does loyalty to a culturally relative way of ecclesiastical organization obstruct the unity of the Church? Such a question assumes a possible distinction between God's ordering through relatively fixed forms, and the more fluid ways of work. It distinguishes but does not separate sociological and theological factors, for God's ordering is involved in the flexible as well as the stable forms. With the historical churches as its primary data (not the Divine order doctrinally articulated) the Commission seeks to disclose those social aspects of the Church which contribute to disunity, and those which aid the cause of unity.

## 2. *Recognition of the positive values of institutions*

The Commission agrees that every Christian group has persistent patterns of common life, and in at least this minimum sense is an institution. Institutional forms often have positive and constructive value for a particular church and for the whole of God's people. The common life is dependent upon their proper function. The work of the Commission is to help the churches become aware of perversions of patterns of life which may have a right and proper function. It seeks to indicate especially those points at which commitment to forms of organization and other factors of a highly relative character create strains between churches, and stand in the way of unity. It seeks to show how discrepancies between a church's profession of its own nature and its ways of work in the contemporary world create difficulties in the life of the whole Church.

The positive values of organizational and other institutional forms for the life, mission and unity of the People of God are evident. These forms exist to manifest the being (*esse*) of the Church or as instruments to be used in carrying out the essential tasks of the Church. When the churches divert their institutions from their true purpose or use them as ends in themselves, they manifest what may be called *institutionalism*. This perversion of the use of institutions, rather than the institutions themselves, is a major hindrance to the life, mission and unity of the Church.

## 3. *Need for operational definition of key terms*

Given the diversity of its membership and the even greater heterogeneity of the constituency of the World Council of Churches, the Commission meets baffling problems in the definition of terms and concepts. For example, definitions of "institution" range widely from any persistent pattern of activity surrounding a human need on the one hand, to a precisely defined list of traits or characteristics such as purpose, charter, personnel, relative stability and norms on the other hand. At the present stage of our work, operational definitions may be carefully worked out and are useful in clarifying the data of our studies. Through widespread critique of the studies, a growing common language may emerge, but the pressing demand for specific research makes it impossible and undesirable to settle all theoretical difficulties at this time.

## 4. *Aspects of institutional behavior*

The Commission has initiated a series of case studies of church schisms, church unions, efforts at union that have failed, and interdenominational and ecumenical

institutions. These phenomena will be analyzed in order to shed light on the functions, structures, and dynamics of the behavior of the churches and their agencies. The following are examples of the questions its scholars are asking :

(a) With reference to function :

What need is being met by a particular organizational pattern ? Is it serving the purpose it is intended to serve ? Or is it actually serving purposes other than that for which it is designed ?

How are religious organizations related, and how do they define their uniqueness ? Is ecclesiastical competition a factor in their continuation ? Do they make for cooperation and unity ? Or do they reinforce divisiveness ? Are they expressions of a purpose grounded in the Gospel ? Or are they peripheral to the primary purposes of the Church ?

(b) With reference to structure :

What patterns of action and relationship exist within and between religious groups ? Does a group actually work through its defined formal patterns ? Or are informal patterns more powerful ? On what basis is leadership recruited ? Do churches gravitate toward conservative persons who will not change patterns, but keep the institution intact ? What has been the impact of powerful personalities in determining patterns of unity and divisiveness in the Church ?

(c) With reference to dynamics :

What changes occur in religious institutions ? How do they occur ? How does innovation leading to unity or to disunity take place ? Has an "ecumenical spirit" affected denominational patterns ? When are tensions within a group creative and when are they destructive with reference to unity ? What sources of change (beliefs, social factors, etc.) lead to institutional isolationism ? What sources lead to ecumenical attitudes ?

##### 5. *The direct and indirect importance of the Commission's work*

The Commission is primarily concerned with the questions of unity and disunity of the Church. Since its approach to this question is novel in comparison to the more traditional theological approach, it finds that little information about religious institutional phenomena has been gathered and analyzed.

This makes imperative certain basic studies, e.g., concerning the functions of the administrative top in a religious group, which are only indirectly related to the question of unity. Many of the study projects pertain directly to our central concern, e.g., the negotiations between Baptists and Disciples in the U.S.A., but others will only indirectly bear on it. The latter studies can illumine the central issue as they give insight to church leaders on problems that exist in all denominations. Only in decades to come will there be data and concepts sufficient for the task to which the Commission is called.

The Commission desires to participate in the total ecumenical conversation. It seeks the guidance of other ecumenical study commissions at the points where concerns merge. It anticipates that its work will extend the insights of other commissions, and enable the churches to attain new levels of understanding in their common movements toward the unity of the Church.



**INTERIM REPORT**  
**of the Working Committee to the Central Committee on**  
**“the Future of Faith and Order”**

**A. Scrutiny and re-assessment of our “functions” as set out in the Constitution of Faith and Order**

- (i) *To proclaim the essential oneness of the Church of Christ and to keep prominently before the World Council and the Churches the obligation to manifest that unity and its urgency for the work of evangelism.*

It is our strong conviction that to proclaim the essential oneness of the Church of Christ involves facing the question *what kind of unity does God demand of His Church?* We agree that no one *definition* of the nature of unity can be a *condition of membership* in the WCC, but Faith and Order exists in order to stand for the unity of the *Church* as the will of God and for a ceaseless effort to know what obedience to that will means concretely. Only so can it be “manifest”. The WCC can have no “neutrality” on whether that question is answered or not. Clearly the World Council is not in a position to say what the answer is in all its fullness; if it were, our quest for the “manifest unity” would already be at an end. As the Toronto statement of 1950 put it (pp. 8-9 : § VI. 1) “the ecumenical movement inevitably creates a situation in which the relationship of the Churches can not remain unchanged... the Council exists to break the deadlock between the Churches.” All the Churches in the Council confront each other under the demand of God Himself that they should learn from Him the nature of the unity which we seek. It has been characteristic of Faith and Order to recognise that patience and thoroughness are needed for this task. But it is also necessary to recognise that in such matters we are not entirely free to proceed at our own pace, that events are forcing upon us various kinds of Christian co-operation, and that if we do not find the right form of churchly unity we shall find ourselves remaining content with a form of organizational unity which is not a true churchly unity because it leaves unfulfilled many of the central requirements of the Church’s life. There is therefore need for a proper sense of urgency lest we lose the time that God gives us. Faith and Order must constantly press upon the Council and the Churches the fact that the question of unity is one upon which an answer has to be given, and that to give no answer means to be shut up to the wrong answer. Specifically Faith and Order must raise this question

- (a) in Assemblies so far as its programme for the whole WCC allows  
 (b) in Central Committee from time to time as best serves, as well as in the Theological Commissions which all at least bear upon the answer.

All these are ways in which Faith and Order makes its witness within the WCC, but in order ultimately to reach the Churches themselves, for whose sake all this activity is organized.

But within the Council, it is also important that every Department should be concerned that unity is borne in mind as it does its work, and we would hope that the WCC secretariat would, from time to time, ask how far their respective Departments are contributing to the fullness of unity.

As plans for the integration with the International Missionary Council proceed, the relation of mission and unity should be more clearly seen. We would ask that National Christian Councils and Councils of Churches should be asked whether their work also makes provision for Faith and Order, so that this connection may be brought home in every region.

As our Churches seek to obey God in the renewal of their confessional and liturgical life, and in promoting its mission, should they not also ask themselves how their obedience in these ways may also serve His demand for unity?

Finally, in all this we must bring home the truth that our divisions contradict the Gospel of reconciliation and hinder the mission and renewal of the Church.

(ii) *To study questions of faith, order and worship with the relevant social, cultural, political, racial and other factors in their bearing on the unity of the Church.*

The *content* of our studies is of fundamental importance, and our first concern must be to ensure that Faith and Order is fully sensitive to the real questions which the Churches are asking, so that its study is vitally related to their real needs. "Study" can be carried out in a great variety of ways. The traditional Faith and Order Theological Commission has a definite rôle where long-term co-operative study is needed. A serious question arises about the *destination* of such studies. We would distinguish to-day between:

- (a) WCC Assemblies for (i) Faith and Order witness at the heart of the WCC
- (ii) Communicating *some* fruits of study

Certain aspects of Theological Commissions' responsibilities can be discharged thus.

(b) *Special* Faith and Order Conferences (including world conferences) will also certainly be needed, because only in gatherings primarily concerned with Faith and Order issues is it possible for the fruits of preceding research to be fully shared, for there to be specific debate on the questions studied in the smaller groups of the Theological Commissions and for the themes for future study to emerge from the give-and-take of representative yet concentrated conference.

(c) Direct contact with the Churches by the influence of delegates, staff visitation and correspondence, and by a careful programme for the dissemination of published material, both direct and through the Churches and national Councils.

But the Theological Commissions are by no means the only *method* of study nor existing themes its only *content*. Different *methods* suit different contents — e.g. field-research, the short series of *ad hoc* conferences, regional enquiry on specific issues, fostering pilot-experiments in local groups, provision for theological faculties and other such special agencies to pay attention, as part of their own responsibilities, to Faith and Order issues.

Content is often also suggested by other Departments of the WCC. Faith and Order must be flexible to respond to such calls. E.g. the relation to unity of current discussions, in other Departments, on the rôle of the laity and on the ordination of women.

The ability to respond quickly to co-operation with other aspects of the WCC is indispensable if Faith and Order is to be, and to be felt to be, the organ of the WCC through which problems bearing upon the unity of the Church can be effectively dealt with when they reach the WCC from its member churches from any quarter whatsoever. It is clear that Faith and Order is not an oracle to *answer* all sorts of such questions, but it is the form in which they can receive prompt and well-qualified consideration in a full ecumenical setting and in which the accumulation of experience of ecumenical work can be brought to bear upon them.

(iii) *To study the theological implications of the existence of the ecumenical movement.*

The Ecumenical Movement in so far as it can rightly be called "the great new fact of our era" presents us with a work of God through His spirit which we must seek to understand and interpret in our own generation. This is an aspect of the total "Mystery of the Church", but it contains specific issues sufficient to make it a distinguishable activity from (i) above, especially in the theological interpretation of such a fact as the WCC itself which, though it is not the Church, is certainly not unrelated to the Church and contains its own significance as a form of Christian unity which needs to be kept

under theological scrutiny. The work begun by the Central Committee at Toronto in 1950 initiated a process which Faith and Order should feel a special responsibility to continue and to extend, for the sake both of those within the WCC and those beyond its membership.

(iv) *To study matters in the present relationships of the Churches to one another which cause difficulties and need theological clarification.*

This function is not easily defined. One of its original consequences was a study of proselytism (later taken over by the Central Committee). But we believe that it marks out a territory of concrete and specific enquiries for which Faith and Order shall continue to be responsible.

(v) *To provide information concerning actual steps taken by the Churches towards reunion.*

The furnishing of the Churches with an accurate and up-to-date information service on re-union negotiations, and the research implied in collecting it, is a service in the direct line of Faith and Order interests which ought certainly to be fulfilled. Although we appreciate the extent to which the secretariat has been able to carry this out in recent years, we are convinced that it could only be done effectively if greater resources of staff were available.

As we have scrutinized these functions as defined in our present constitution, we wish to re-affirm our adherence to them, and to see them carried out with vigour. But we feel that the experience of the years since the Constitution was drafted would make us want to re-state them for the future with some change of emphasis, expression and arrangement. Pending an appropriate moment for the revision of our Constitution, we content ourselves with this commentary upon their meaning.

## **B. Some further implications in our work**

We would go on to urge certain other concerns which we believe we are called by God to undertake, which, although not specifically indicated in our present terms of reference, are in keeping with the spirit and tradition of the Faith and Order movement.

### *(1) Unity negotiations*

One of the striking consequences of nearly 50 years of Faith and Order work has been the creation of an atmosphere in which Churches have been able to pass on from the discussion of unity in principle to negotiate concrete local unions. Nothing should impair the freedom of the Churches themselves in this matter. But we would re-emphasize Constitution 4 (iv) \* as meaning in our day that part of the "service" of Faith and Order must be to take a far more active attitude towards the various plans for unity without itself, of course, ever being the sponsor of any specific plan. But we believe we could and should serve the Churches by :

(a) providing for "Consultations" as part of our own programme in which representatives of Churches engaged in union-negotiation could meet with each other and with a wide circle of those interested, to learn from each other and to see their own negotiations in a wider context. The gratitude expressed for the "unofficial consultations" already held encourages us to make them in future a more direct responsibility of Faith

---

\* "(iv) Only Churches themselves are competent to take actual steps towards reunion by entering into negotiations with one another. The work of the Movement is not to formulate schemes and tell the Churches what they ought to do, but to act as the handmaid of the Churches in the preparatory work of clearing away misunderstandings, discussing obstacles to reunion, and issuing reports which are submitted to the Churches for their consideration."



and Order whenever its own meetings draw together a widely representative gathering which includes such interests.

(b) analyzing the various schemes in current discussion, with a view to discovering the bearing which each may have on other negotiations and the solutions of difficulties found in them which may be useful to other Churches discussing union.

(c) If inter-church consultations of the kind contemplated in paragraph (a) above should lead to invitations to the Faith and Order Commission to assist at any point in unity negotiations, the officers of the Commission should regard themselves as empowered to appoint Commission members or members of theological sub-commissions or the Secretary to the Commission to accept the invitations, subject to conformity to the general policy of the Commission and to advice applicable to the particular cases. The officers should also be ready to provide relevant material from the experience of the Commission. It is hoped that this readiness to render any assistance called for will become known to the Churches.

(2) *Regional Work and other Meetings* which are less than fully comprehensive Faith and Order Conferences.

By an action of the Faith and Order Working Committee at Davos in 1955, endorsed by the Central Committee in the same year, the Faith and Order Commission is already free to interpret paragraph 4 of its Constitution as allowing meetings which are not based on invitations "addressed to Christian Churches throughout the World."

The success of the New Zealand and Oberlin Conferences, of the Lutheran-Reformed meetings in Europe, and the Indian regional conference, leads us to mention here gatherings of this kind as being in future part of our regular concern. In particular we would hope that many groups who find themselves in a small minority at our normal conferences could sometimes be afforded opportunities to meet in a setting in which they would be relieved of some of the disadvantages and inhibitions of appearing always as a minority.

We would also consider whether other groups than churches actually negotiating should be drawn into contact with each other — e.g. Churches resulting from union-negotiations to meet with representatives from some of the world confessional organizations with which their component Churches are related ; or certain churches in a particular area be invited to enter into conversation on Faith and Order themes.

In this context, we would like to stress the value of active Faith and Order departments in National Christian Councils and Councils of Churches, with which the Faith and Order secretariat is glad to co-operate. Local pilot-schemes of study, under Faith and Order auspices, could occasionally be arranged in consultation with the national council concerned.

(3) *Relations with Christians outside the WCC membership*

One of our basic principles is to draw churches out of isolation into conference. In this connection, we believe that we have a responsibility, in this time in which our member churches have been able to overcome that isolation by meeting in the WCC, especially towards those Churches which have chosen not to avail themselves of that particular opportunity. We also note that we are empowered to invite representatives of such Churches to serve in our Commission (v. Constitution paragraph 5 (ii) b), and so, by implication, on our Theological Commissions.

We have especially in mind two groups among those who "accept Our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour."

(a) *The Roman Catholic Church* constitutes so large and serious a part of Christendom that we are bound to take it into consideration in our work for Christian unity. But we realize the very serious difficulties which arise, both from their side and from ours, to hinder any official or clearly defined relationship. Yet Faith and Order is an aspect

of the WCC in which the Roman Catholic Church has shown an interest. Roman Catholic theologians have made important contributions by their writings to the discussion of Faith and Order issues. We believe that this theological discussion should be pursued in whatever ways may be mutually acceptable.

(b) *Protestant Churches* outside the WCC need another form of approach, for, as compared with the unity (though complex) of the Roman Catholic Church, we are here dealing with very diverse entities. But we believe that many of them are ready to enter into common study with the WCC and to meet in personal contact in various countries and regions. They comprise another group of fellow-Christians with whom Faith and Order should enter into fellowship on the ground of common concern for Christian mission and unity.

With regard to them both, we would urge that Faith and Order should :

(i) aim at a situation in the WCC staff which ensured that there should always be people sufficiently free from other commitments to make it a first charge on their time to be in continuous, personal and well-informed contact with the whole complexity of both these groups ;

(ii) on the basis of such contact, the Faith and Order Secretariat, Working Committee and other groups in Faith and Order would be in a position to be kept informed of developments and openings, and so able to seek their participation in our theological work where it was then deemed possible and advisable.

### C. Consequences for Organization

We fully recognize that we are part of a complex organism in the WCC, which has total problems of finance and structural development which have to reckon with many other concerns beside our own. But it is our duty to speak of our conception of the "future of Faith and Order."

Our deepest concern is that the World Council as a whole should always serve that *churchly* unity into which God calls His People to be reconciled through His Son. As partial consequences of responding to that call, our separated churches have found in the WCC an organ through which to do many things together, and for all of this we give thanks to God. We believe that all the tasks we have outlined, and others which we trust that He will show us, together constitute a central part of the Council's work, and an ingredient in the whole which keeps all our churches aware of the full unity of Word and Sacrament, Ministry and Mission, in universal and local fellowship.

The Working Committee is responsible for examining not only the rôle of the Faith and Order Commission within the WCC but also the internal organization of the Faith and Order Commission itself. In this connection we believe it to be necessary to clarify the meaning and implications of membership in the Faith and Order Commission. Each member should be given a clear understanding of his responsibilities towards the Faith and Order Commission and towards his own Church : and leaders of Churches should be fully cognizant of the fact that they are represented in the Faith and Order Commission so that they may be disposed to appropriate the experience of such members and give them due support. Moreover it may prove necessary to re-examine the manner in which members are added to the Faith and Order Commission in the light of requirements imposed by its future tasks.

It is too early in the total WCC process of financial and structural development for anyone to see clearly the details of what is practicable. But our discussion on the future of Faith and Order has made clear our conviction that at least the following provisions should be made, if at all possible :

(1) There should be a report to the Central Committee every year, prepared by the Faith and Order Working Committee, on recent developments in the field of Christian unity.

(2) Provision should be made in every WCC Assembly for a prominent place to be given to issues of unity.

(3) *World* conferences specifically on Faith and Order have an irreplaceable rôle and provision needs to be made for them from time to time.

(4) The programme we have outlined above also clearly implies a larger staff than is at present available.

(5) The senior secretary of Faith and Order needs to have the closest relationship with the central Executive of the WCC secretariat.

This raises the question of whether these results can be achieved unless Faith and Order has the status of a Division, and we request that the Faith and Order secretary should discuss the implications of these suggestions in the coming year, so that the next meeting of the Faith and Order subcommittee on its future, and the next meeting of the Working Committee, may receive further information.

We believe that, in such ways as these, Faith and Order would be more clearly seen to occupy a place in the structure of the WCC which truthfully reflects its central and fundamental rôle in the whole ecumenical movement.

---



**PROPOSED FAITH AND ORDER PROGRAMME  
1959-1963**

	WORKING COMMITTEE	THEOLOGICAL COMMISSIONS	COMMISSION	OTHER MEETINGS
1959	WCC Combined Working Committees (Assembly Preparation)  Plus regular Working Committee (August 4-14)	<i>Christ and the Church :</i> Joint Meeting Eur.-NA Sections (July 20-Aug. 1)  <i>Institutionalism :</i> Enlarged meeting in Europe		Future Committee
1960	(same)	<i>Institutionalism :</i> Full Meeting  <i>Tradition :</i> Joint Meeting of Eur.-Amer. Sections	Triennial Meeting	Union Negotiations Consultation  Future Committee
1961	Working Committee (regular meeting)	<i>Worship :</i> Meeting in Asia?		W.C.C. Assembly
1962	(same)	Preparation of Final Reports in all Commissions		
1963	(same)	Combined Meeting of all Commissions	Triennial Meeting	Union Negotiations Consultation

MEMBERS OF THE FAITH AND ORDER COMMISSION  
AND THE SECRETARIAT OF THE COMMISSION

---

(\* signifies member of the Working Committee)

*Chairman* : Dean DOUGLAS HORTON (United Church of Christ, U.S.A.),  
Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge 38, Mass., U.S.A.

*Vice-Chairman* : Rt. Rev. J. E. L. NEWBIGIN, Bishop in Madura (Church  
of South India), Tallakulam, Madurai, South India.

*Secretary* : Rev. Dr. KEITH R. BRIDSTON (Evangelical Lutheran Church,  
U.S.A.), 17 route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland.

*Members*

Professor H. S. ALIVISATOS (Church of Greece), 27 Voulis Street, Athens,  
Greece.

Bishop H. B. AMSTUTZ (Methodist Church in S.E. Asia), Methodist Head-  
quarters, P.O. Box 483, Singapore 6, Malaya.

Most Rev. Archbishop ATHENAGORAS, Metropolitan of Thyateira (Ecu-  
menical Patriarchate of Constantinople, Exarchate in Western Europe),  
8 Dawson Place, London W.2, England.

Rev. Dr. FARID AUDEH (Evangelical Synod of Syria and Lebanon), c/o  
American Mission, P.O. Box 235, Beirut, Lebanon.

Bishop S. U. BARBIERI (Methodist Church in Argentina), Rivadavia 4044,  
Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Most Rev. W. F. BARFOOT, Primate of All Canada (Anglican Church in  
Canada), Synod Office, Trinity Hall, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

\* PERCY W. BARTLETT (Society of Friends in Great Britain), 120 Southsea  
Avenue, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex, England.

President CONRAD BERGENDOFF (Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church,  
U.S.A.), 835 35th Street, Rock Island, Illinois, U.S.A.

Dr. H. BERKHOF (Dutch Reformed Church), Driebergen, Horstlaan 3,  
Netherlands.

Rev. Professor J. H. BODENSIECK (American Lutheran Church), Wartburg  
Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa, U.S.A.

Rev. C. B. BRINK (Dutch Reformed Church of S. Africa in Transvaal),  
21 Rhodes Avenue, Parktown, Johannesburg, South Africa.

Rev. Professor DAVID CAIRNS (Church of Scotland), 140 Hamilton Place,  
Aberdeen, Scotland.

Rev. Professor ROBERT L. CALHOUN (United Church of Christ, U.S.A.),  
409 Prospect Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A.

Rev. Principal L. G. CHAMPION (Baptist Union of Great Britain and  
Ireland), The Baptist College, Woodland Road, Bristol 8, England.

\* Rev. Principal J. R. CHANDRAN (Church of South India), United  
Theological College, 17 Miller's Road, Bangalore 1, South India.

- Rev. Principal H. F. LOVELL COCKS (Congregational Union of England and Wales), Western College, 1 Cotham Road, Bristol 6, England.
- Rev. Dr. G. R. CRAGG (United Church of Canada), 3407 Ontario Avenue, Montreal 25, Canada.
- Rev. MARCOS DAOUD (Coptic Orthodox Church), Faggala P.O. Box 44, Cairo, Egypt.
- Rev. Professor V. E. DEVADUTT (Council of Baptist Churches in North India), Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester 20, N.Y., U.S.A.
- Rev. Professor EDWARD A. DOWEY (Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.), Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.
- \* Rt. Rev. ANGUS DUN, Bishop of Washington (Protestant Episcopal Church, U.S.A.), 1702 Rhode Island Avenue N.W., Washington 6, D.C., U.S.A.
- Rev. S. DURAIKAN (Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches of India), c/o Bishop's Office, Tranquebar House, Tiruchirappalli, South India.
- Rev. Director PEHR EDWALL (Church of Sweden), Samariterhemmet, Uppsala, Sweden.
- Dean S. J. ENGLAND (Disciples of Christ, U.S.A.), 2202 East Maple Avenue, Enid, Oklahoma, U.S.A.
- \* Rev. Professor H. D'ESPINE (Swiss Protestant Church Federation), 2 avenue de Combes, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Rev. Dr. R. NEWTON FLEW (Methodist Church of Great Britain), 49 Glisson Road, Cambridge, England.
- \* Rev. Professor GEORGES FLOROVSKY (Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, Ecumenical Patriarchate), Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge 38, Mass., U.S.A.
- Professor Dr. HAAKON FLOTTORP (Church of Norway), Kristiansand off. Laererskole, Kristiansand, Norway.
- Rev. NORMAN GILKISON (Presbyterian Church of New Zealand), 33 Young Street, St. Kilda, Dunedin, S. 2, New Zealand.
- Professor D. GLUMAÇ (Orthodox Patriarchate of Serbia), Cara Lazara 16, Belgrade, Yugoslavia.
- Rev. JAMES GRAY (Churches of Christ in Great Britain and Ireland), 49 Holmfield Road, Leicester, England.
- \* President PERRY E. GRESHAM (Disciples of Christ, U.S.A.), Pendleton Heights, Bethany College, Bethany, W.Va., U.S.A.
- Bishop E. C. GULIN (Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland), Tampere, Finland.
- Rev. W. F. HAMBLY (Methodist Church of Australia), Lincoln College, 45 Brougham Place, North Adelaide, South Australia.
- Rev. Professor ROBERT T. HANDY (American Baptist Convention), Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th Street, New York 27, U.S.A.
- \* Rev. Professor R. R. HARTFORD (Church of Ireland), 39 Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.
- Rev. Professor DAVID W. HAY (Presbyterian Church in Canada), Knox College, Toronto, Canada.
- U BA HMYIN (Burma Baptist Convention), American Baptist Mission, 143 St. John's Road, Rangoon, Burma.



- Bishop IVAN LEE HOLT (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), 20 North Kingshighway, St. Louis 9, Missouri, U.S.A.
- Rt. Rev. A. W. HOWELLS, Bishop of Lagos (Church of the Province of West Africa), Bishops court, Lagos, Nigeria.
- Professor Dr. J. HROMADKA (Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren), Moravska 47, Prague, Czechoslovakia.
- Professor BASIL IOANNIDIS (Church of Greece), Theological Faculty, University, Athens, Greece.
- \* Generalsuperintendent Dr. G. JACOB (Evangelical Church in Germany), Berlin-Charlottenburg 2, Jebensstrasse 3, Germany.
- \* Metropolitan JUHANON MAR THOMA (Mar Thoma Syrian Church of Malabar), Tiruvalla P.O., Travancore, South India.
- \* Rev. Professor T. A. KANTONEN (United Lutheran Church in America), 954 Pythian Avenue, Springfield, Ohio, U.S.A.
- Professor Dr. E. KINDER (Evangelical Church in Germany), Martin Lutherstr. 5, Münster in Westf., Germany.
- Rev. Professor D. BROUGHTON KNOX (Church of England in Australia), Moore College, Newtown, N.S.W., Australia.
- \* Professor Dr. CHRYS. KONSTANTINIDIS (Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople), Üsküdar, Allâme Caddesi 82, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Ds. P.D. LATUIHAMALLO (Protestant Church of the Moluccas), Sekolah Tinggi Theologia, Pegangsaan Timur 27, Djarkarta, Indonesia.
- Bishop HANNS LILJE (Evangelical Church in Germany) Calenbergerstr. 34, Hannover, Germany.
- President JOHN A. MACKAY (Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.), 86 Mercer Street, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.
- \* Rev. Principal JOHN MARSH (Congregational Union of England and Wales), Mansfield College, Oxford, England.
- Rt. Rev. LAKDASA DE MEL, Bishop of Kurunagala (Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon), Bishop's House, Kurunagala, Ceylon.
- Rev. Professor PAUL S. MINEAR (United Church of Christ, U.S.A.), 247 St. Ronan Street, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.
- Professor Dr. E. MOLLAND (Church of Norway), Jacob Aals gt. 45 b, Oslo, Norway.
- Dr. C. P. MOREHOUSE (Protestant Episcopal Church, U.S.A.), 14 East 41st Street, New York 17, N.Y., U.S.A.
- Dean WALTER G. MUELDER (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), 745 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
- President SHIRO MURATA (Church of Christ in Japan), 96 Sheba-Shirokane, Imazatocho, Minato-Ku, Tokyo, Japan.
- Dean J. ROBERT NELSON (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), The Divinity School, Vanderbilt University, Nashville 5, Tenn., U.S.A.
- Professor Dr. W. NIESEL (Evangelical Church in Germany), Schoeller, Post Dornap, Germany.
- Rev. Dr. D. T. NILES (Methodist Church in Ceylon), Vembadi, Jaffna, Ceylon.
- Principal J. NØRGAARD (Baptist Union of Denmark), Tølløse, Denmark.

- Bishop ANDERS NYGREN (Church of Sweden), Helgonavägen 10, Lund, Sweden.
- \* Rev. Professor A. C. OUTLER (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas 5, Texas, U.S.A.
- Archimandrite PARTHENIOS (Patriarchate of Alexandria), Greek Orthodox Patriarchate, Alexandria, Egypt.
- \* Rev. Dr. E. A. PAYNE (Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland), Baptist Church House, 4 Southampton Row, London, W.C.1, England.
- Rev. Father K. PHILIPOS (Orthodox Syrian Church of Malabar), Cheria Pally, Kottayam, Travancore, South India.
- Most Rev. A. M. RAMSEY, Archbishop of York (Church of England), Bishophthorpe, York, England.
- Rt. Rev. A. E. J. RAWLINSON, Bishop of Derby (Church of England), Breadsall Mount, Derby, England.
- Dr. H. G. RENKEWITZ (Moravian Church, Germany), Evangelische Akademie, Arnoldshain bei Schmitten/Taunus, Germany.
- Rt. Rev. KENNETH RICHES, Bishop of Lincoln (Church of England), Bishop's House, Eastgate, Lincoln, England.
- Most Rev. Archbishop A. RINKEL (Old Catholic Church), Emmalaan 8, Utrecht, Netherlands.
- \* Rev. Principal HAROLD ROBERTS (Methodist Church of Great Britain), 2 College House, Richmond College, Richmond, Surrey, England.
- Dr. PRESTON T. ROBERTS, Jr. (General Conference of the Society of Friends), 5619 S. Dorchester Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois, U.S.A.
- Rev. Professor E. GORDON RUPP (Methodist Church of Great Britain), 11 the Meade, Chorltonville, Manchester 21, England.
- \* Professor Dr. E. W. L. SCHLINK (Evangelical Church in Germany), Heidelberg, Plankengasse 1, Germany.
- Rev. Professor A. SCHMEMANN (Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America), 537 West 121st Street, New York 27, N.Y., U.S.A.
- His Holiness MAR SHIMUM (Church of the East and the Assyrians, U.S.A.), The Patriarchate, East River Road, Box 1808, Modesto, Calif., U.S.A.
- Bishop FERDINAND SIGG (Methodist Church, Central and Southern Europe), Badenerstrasse 69, Zürich, Switzerland.
- Rev. Professor J. A. SITTLER (United Lutheran Church, U.S.A.), 4833 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago 15, Illinois, U.S.A.
- \* Rev. Dr. JOHN E. SKOGLUND (American Baptist Convention), First Baptist Church, Harvard at Seneca, Seattle 22, Wash., U.S.A.
- \* Professor Dr. K. E. SKYDSGAARD (Evangelical Lutheran Church of Denmark), St. Kannikestraede 11, 2, Copenhagen K., Denmark.
- \* Rev. Professor T. M. TAYLOR (United Presbyterian Church of North America), Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary, 616 North Highland Avenue, Pittsburgh 6, Penna., U.S.A.
- Rev. Professor J. N. THOMAS (Presbyterian Church, U.S.), 1002 Westwood Avenue, Richmond 27, Virginia, U.S.A.
- His Holiness TIRAN NERSOYAN (Armenian Apostolic Church), The Patriarchate, Jerusalem, Jordan.

- \* Canon O. S. TOMKINS (Church of England), Warden's House, The Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln, England. *After 6 January 1959*: Bishop of Bristol, Bishop's House, Clifton Hill, Bristol 8, England. *Chairman of the Working Committee.*
- \* Rev. Professor T. F. TORRANCE (Church of Scotland), 21 South Oswald Road, Edinburgh 9, Scotland.
- Dr. L. VETÖ (Lutheran Church of Hungary), Ulloi-utca 24, Budapest, Hungary.
- Pasteur CHARLES WESTPHAL (Reformed Church of France), 62 rue de Rome, Paris 8<sup>e</sup>, France.
- \* Professor Dr. G. F. WINGREN (Church of Sweden), Vintergatan 2c, Lund, Sweden.
- Rev. Dr. J. W. WINTERHAGER (Evangelical Church in Germany), Niedstr. 27, Berlin-Friedenau, Germany.
- Rt. Rev. M. H. YASHIRO (Anglican Church in Japan), 5 Nakayamate-dori, 3-chome, Ikutaku, Kobe, Japan.
- Professor L. ZANDER (Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople: Exarchate for Russians in the West), 4 rue Alsace-Lorraine, Boulogne-sur-Seine, France.



## MEMBERSHIP OF THEOLOGICAL COMMISSIONS

### THEOLOGICAL COMMISSION ON CHRIST AND THE CHURCH

#### American Section

- Prof. R. L. CALHOUN (United Church of Christ), 409 Prospect Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A. *Chairman*
- Prof. W. N. PITTENGER (Protestant Episcopal Church), General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York 11, N.Y., U.S.A. *Vice-Chairman*.
- Rev. Dr. G. R. CRAGG (United Church of Canada), 3407 Ontario Avenue, Montreal 25, Canada. *Secretary*.
- Prof. CLAUDE WELCH (Methodist Church), 409 Prospect Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A. *Associate Secretary*.
- Prof. T. ARIGA (Church of Christ in Japan), Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan. *Corresponding member*.
- Prof. N. S. F. FERRÉ (Methodist Church), Andover-Newton Theological Seminary, Andover Center 59, Mass., U.S.A.
- Prof. F. V. FILSON (Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.), McCormick Theological Seminary, 2330 North Halstead Street, Chicago 14, Ill., U.S.A.
- Prof. GEORGES FLOROVSKY (Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, Ecumenical Patriarchate), Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge 38, Mass., U.S.A.
- Prof. E. R. HARDY (Protestant Episcopal Church), 46 Mansfield Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A.
- Dean WALTER HARRELSON (American Baptist Convention), Divinity School, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill., U.S.A.
- Prof. T. A. KANTONEN (United Lutheran Church), 294 Pythian Avenue, Springfield, Ohio, U.S.A.
- Prof. JOHN KNOX (Methodist Church), Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th Street, New York 27, N.Y., U.S.A.
- Prof. P. S. MINEAR (United Church of Christ), 247 St. Ronan Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A.
- Dean J. ROBERT NELSON (Methodist Church), The Divinity School, Vanderbilt University, Nashville 5, Tenn., U.S.A.
- Prof. H. RICHARD NIEBUHR (United Church of Christ), 409 Prospect Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A.

#### European Section

- Bishop ANDERS NYGREN (Church of Sweden), Helgonavägen 10, Lund, Sweden. *Chairman*.
- Rev. P. S. WATSON (Methodist Church of Great Britain), 32 Jesus Lane, Cambridge, England. *Vice-Chairman*.
- Rev. Principal G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY (Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland), Spurgeon's College, South Norwood Hill, London S.E. 25, England. *Secretary*.
- DR. MAURICE A. CREASEY (Society of Friends in Great Britain), Woodbrooke College, Selly Oak, Birmingham 29, England.

- Prof. Dr. OSCAR CULLMANN (Swiss Protestant Church Federation), Hebelstrasse 17, Basel, Switzerland. Corresponding member.
- Prof. CHRYS. KONSTANTINIDIS (Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople), Üsküdar, Allâme Caddesi 82, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Prof. Dr. WALTER KRECK (Evangelical Church in Germany), Gregor Mendelstr. 27, Bonn, Germany.
- Prof. G. W. H. LAMPE (Church of England), The University, Edmund Street, Birmingham 3, England.
- Principal JOHN MARSH (Congregational Union of England and Wales), Mansfield College, Oxford, England.
- Rev. C. G. W. NICHOLLS (Episcopal Church in Scotland), 11 Chalmers Street, Edinburgh 3, Scotland.
- Prof. Dr. EDMUND SCHLINK (Evangelical Church in Germany), Plankengasse 1, Heidelberg, Germany.
- Prof. T. F. TORRANCE (Church of Scotland), 21 South Oswald Road, Edinburgh 9, Scotland.
- Prof. G. F. WINGREN (Church of Sweden), Vintergatan 2c, Lund, Sweden.

## THEOLOGICAL COMMISSIONS ON WORSHIP

### A. North America

- Prof. J. A. SITTLER (United Lutheran Church), 4833 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago 15, Ill., U.S.A. *Chairman*.
- Prof. L. J. TRINTERUD (Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.), 2330 North Halstead Street, Chicago 14, Ill., U.S.A. *Vice-Chairman*.
- Dr. PRESTON T. ROBERTS, Jr. (General Conference of the Society of Friends), 5619 S. Dorchester Avenue, Chicago 37, Ill., U.S.A. *Secretary*.
- Prof. MARKUS BARTH (Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.), 4846 S. Kimbark Avenue, Chicago 15, Ill., U.S.A.
- President C. J. I. BERGENDOFF (Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church), 835 35th Street, Rock Island, Ill., U.S.A.
- Prof. R. E. CUSHMAN (Methodist Church), Duke Divinity School, Durham, N.C., U.S.A.
- Prof. FRED HERZOG (United Church of Christ), Mission House Seminary, Plymouth, Wisconsin, U.S.A.
- Prof. WINTHROP HUDSON (American Baptist Convention), Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester 20, N.Y., U.S.A.
- Prof. J. P. HYATT (Disciples of Christ), The Divinity School, Vanderbilt University, Nashville 5, Tenn., U.S.A.
- Prof. WILLIAM M. KELLY (United Church of Canada), Emmanuel College, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Prof. J. C. RYLAARSDAM (Reformed Church in America), Federated Theological Faculty, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill., U.S.A.
- Prof. ALEXANDER SCHMEMANN (Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America), 537 West 121st Street, New York 27, N.Y., U.S.A.

- Prof. M. H. SHEPHERD (Protestant Episcopal Church), Church Divinity School of the Pacific, 2451 Ridge Road, Berkeley, Calif., U.S.A.
- Prof. D. D. WILLIAMS (United Church of Christ), 5757 University Avenue, Chicago 37, Ill., U.S.A.
- Prof. F. W. YOUNG (Protestant Episcopal Church), Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, Austin, Texas, U.S.A.

### B. Europe

- Rt. Rev. KENNETH RICHES, Bishop of Lincoln (Church of England), Bishop's House, Eastgate, Lincoln, England. *Chairman*
- Prof. REGIN PRENTER (Evangelical Lutheran Church of Denmark), Trøjborgvej 58, Aarhus, Denmark. *Vice-Chairman*
- Rev. A. RAYMOND GEORGE (Methodist Church of Great Britain), Lathbury House, Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds 6, England. *Secretary*.
- Prof. Dr. J. J. VON ALLMEN (Swiss Protestant Church Federation), Evole 68, Neuchâtel, Switzerland.
- Prof. JEAN BOSCH (Reformed Church of France), 53-55 avenue du Maine, Paris 14<sup>e</sup>, France.
- The Ven. J. O. COBHAM (Church of England), The College, Durham, England.
- Prof. Dr. WILHELM HAHN (Evangelical Church in Germany), Kapellenweg 8, Heidelberg, Germany.
- Rev. Principal GWENYTH HUBBLE (Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland), Carey Hall, Selly Oak, Birmingham 29, England.
- Dr. A. F. N. LEKKERKERKER (Dutch Reformed Church), Lessinglaan 92, Utrecht, Netherlands.
- Prof. Dr. H. RIESENFELD (Church of Sweden), Theological Faculty, University of Uppsala, Uppsala, Sweden.
- Prof. Dr. ALBERT E. RÜTHY (Old Catholic Church of Switzerland), Muristrasse 6, Berne, Switzerland.
- Prof. D. HERMANN SCHLINGENSIEPEN (Evangelical Church in Germany), Missionstrasse 9, Wuppertal-Barmen, Germany.
- Dr. VILMOS VAJTA (Church of Sweden), Lutheran World Federation, 17 route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland.

### C. East Asia

- Principal J. R. CHANDRAN (Church of South India), United Theological College, 17 Miller's Road, Bangalore 1, South India. *Chairman*.
- Rt. Rev. LAKDASA DE MEL, Bishop of Kurunagala (Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon), Kurunagala, Ceylon. *Vice-Chairman*.
- President C. KISHI (Lutheran Church in Japan), Lutheran Theological Seminary, Saginomiya, Sugunami, Tokyo, Japan. *Vice-Chairman*.
- Dr. A. N. GOPAL (Andhra Evangelical Lutheran Church), Lutheran Theological College, Luthergiri, Rajahmundry, Andhra Pradesh, India. *Secretary*.
- Dr. FRANCISCO S. GALVEZ (Methodist Church in the Philippines), P.O. Box 756, Manila, Philippines.

- U BA HMYIN (Burma Baptist Convention), American Baptist Mission, 143 St. John's Road, Rangoon, Burma.
- Rev. Dr. SVERRE HOLTH (Anglican), 85 Cavanagh Road, Singapore 9, Malaya.
- Rt. Rev. WILLIAM Q. LASH, Bishop of Bombay (Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon), St. John's House, Duxbury Lane, Colaba, Bombay 5, India.
- Ds. P. D. LATUIHAMALLO (Protestant Church of the Moluccas), Sekolah Tinggi Theologia, Pegangsaan Timur 27, Djarkarta, Indonesia.
- Rev. KEN MUTO (Nippon Kirisuto Kyodan, Japan), Chu-O Church, Haruki-cho, Hongo, Tokyo, Japan.
- Rev. Fr. KORAH PHILIPOS (Orthodox Syrian Church of Malabar), Cheria Pally, Kottayam, Travancore, South India.
- Rev. Dr. A. THAKUR DAS (United Church of Northern India and Pakistan), 8 Empress Road, Lahore, West Pakistan.

## THEOLOGICAL COMMISSION ON TRADITION AND TRADITIONS

### American Section

- Prof. A. C. OUTLER (Methodist Church), Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas 5, Texas, U.S.A. *Chairman.*
- Prof. GEORGES FLOROVSKY (Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, Ecumenical Patriarchate), Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge 38, Mass., U.S.A. *Vice-Chairman.*
- Prof. D. W. HAY (Presbyterian Church in Canada), Knox College, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. *Secretary.*
- Prof. SYDNEY E. AHLSTROM (Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church), 409 Prospect Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A.
- Prof. GEORGE B. CAIRD (United Church of Canada), McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
- Prof. W. A. CLEBSCH (Protestant Episcopal Church), Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, Austin, Texas, U.S.A.
- Prof. E. R. FAIRWEATHER (Anglican Church in Canada), Trinity College, Hoskin Avenue, Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada.
- Prof. WILHELM PAUCK (United Church of Christ), Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th Street, New York 27, N.Y., U.S.A.
- Prof. J. J. PELIKAN (Slovak Evangelical Lutheran Church), University of Chicago Divinity School, Chicago 37 Ill., U.S.A.

### European Section

- Prof. K. E. SKYDSGAARD (Evangelical Lutheran Church of Denmark), St. Kannikestraede 11, 2, Copenhagen K., Denmark. *Chairman.*
- Prof. S. L. GREENSLADE (Church of England), 12 The College, Durham, England. *Vice-Chairman*
- Prof. KONSTANTIN BONIS (Church of Greece), Epirou 27/VI, Athens, Greece.



- Prof. Dr. GERHARDT EBELING (Evangelical Church in Germany) Nägeli-  
strasse 5, Zürich, Switzerland.
- Dr. E. FLESSEMAN VAN LEER (Dutch Reform Church), Amstelhoven 10,  
Amstelveen, Netherlands.
- Rev. D. T. JENKINS (Congregational Union of England and Wales),  
The King's Weigh House Church, Duke Street, Grosvenor Square,  
London, W.1, England.
- Prof. Dr. JEAN-LOUIS LEUBA (Swiss Protestant Church Federation),  
30 chemin de la Caille, Neuchâtel, Switzerland.
- Prof. EINAR MOLLAND (Church of Norway), Jacob Aals gt. 45b, Oslo,  
Norway.
- Prof. J. SCHNEIDER (Baptist Church in Germany), Johanna-Stegenstrasse 14,  
Berlin-Steglitz, Germany.

### STUDY COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONALISM

- Dean WALTER G. MUELDER (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), 745 Common-  
wealth Avenue, Boston 15, Mass., U.S.A. *Chairman*.
- Prof. NILS EHRENSTRÖM (Church of Sweden), 745 Commonwealth Avenue,  
Boston 15, Mass., U.S.A. *Secretary*.
- Prof. CHANDRAN DEVANESEN (Church of South India), Madras Christian  
College, Tambaram, Chingleput District, South India.
- Dr. HANS DOMBOIS (Evangelical Church in Germany), Schmeilweg 5,  
Heidelberg, Germany.
- Dean C. R. FEILDING (Anglican Church in Canada), Trinity College,  
Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Dr. JAMES GUSTAFSON (United Church of Christ, U.S.A.) 409 Prospect  
Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A.
- Dr. BERNDT GUSTAFSSON (Church of Sweden), Rörlägggaravägen 10, Lund,  
Sweden.
- Rev. Dr. WILLIAM PICKERING (Church of England) St. John's College,  
University of Manitoba, Winnipeg 9, Canada.
- Prof. F. E. RECTOR (Disciples of Christ), School of Religion, Butler  
University, Indianapolis 7, Ind., U.S.A.
- Prof. FREDERICK A. SHIPPEY (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), 52 Fairview  
Avenue, Madison, N.J., U.S.A.

## RECENT FAITH AND ORDER PUBLICATIONS

- FOC No. 23 Minutes of Working Committee meeting, Herrenalb, Germany, 17-20 July 1956. Sw. Fr. 2.—; 2s. 6d.; \$.50
- FOC No. 24 Responses of the Churches to the Report of the Third World Conference on Faith and Order, Lund 1952. Geneva 1957. Sw. Fr. 2.—; 2s. 6d.; \$.50
- FOC No. 25 Minutes of the Faith and Order Commission meeting, New Haven, 20-25 July 1957. Sw. Fr. 2.—; 2s. 6d.; \$.50
- FOC No. 26 Minutes of the Working Committee meeting, Geneva, 15-20 July 1958. Geneva, Sw. Fr. 2.50; 3s.; \$.75.
- FOC No. 11b Survey of Church Union Negotiations (offprint from *The Ecumenical Review*, October 1955). Sw. Fr. —.50; 9d.; \$.15
- FOC No. 11c Survey of Church Union Negotiations (offprint from *The Ecumenical Review*, April 1957). Sw. Fr. —.50; 9d.; \$.15

*Leaflet for the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity*, in English, German and French : Available in quantity from WCC, Geneva, British Council of Churches, London, and WCC, New York.

*Church Union Schemes, Agreements on Intercommunion etc.* — a number of the most recent documents are available from the Faith and Order office in Geneva. A list of these may be obtained from the Secretary.



